NATIONAL ARCHIVES MICROFILM PUBLICATIONS

MICROCOPY
215
ROLL
29

NATIONAL ARCHIVES MICROFILM PUBLICATIONS

Microcopy No. 215

MINUTES OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Roll 29

October 6, 1919 - June 6, 1921

THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES
NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS SERVICE
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Washington: 1954

NOTES ON ROLL 29

The two volumes reproduced on this roll have the following backstrip titles: (1) "Minutes / 1919 / Supreme Court / of the / United States" and (2) "Minutes / 1920 / Supreme Court / of the / United States." They contain the minutes of the Supreme Court of the United States from October 6, 1919, to June 6, 1921.

The first volume contains the minutes of the Court from October 6, 1919, to June 7, 1920, and the second, from October 4, 1920, to June 6, 1921.

VOLUME

1919

61 55

At the Capitol of the United States, in the City of Washington, and District of Columbia, being the present seat of the National Government of the United States, on the first Monday of October (being the sixth day of the same month) in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and nineteen and of the Independence of the United States the one hundred and forty-fourth, the Supreme Court of the United States met agreeably to law.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

The Chief Justice announced that, owing to the illness of the President of the United States, the usual visit to him will not be

motions for admission to the bar and other motions noticed for today and which are ready for submission, and that the call of the docket will commence tomorrow Pursuant to the 26th Rule.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General King it is ordered that Ernie Adamson, Esquire of New York City; William S. Evans, Esquire of New York City; Harry L. Underwood, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia; and Frank K. Nebeker, Esquire of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert B. Cummins it is ordered that James L. Parish, Esquire, and R. M. Stalnes, Esquire of Des Moines, State of Iowa be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clement R. Stickney it is ordered that William R. Moss, Esquire of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and

accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Attorney General Palmer, it is ordered that Will M. Donkins, Esquire, of San Diego, State of California and W. J. Sangston, Jr., Esquire, of Uniontown, State of Pennsylvania be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George E. Hazelton, it is ordered that John N. Pickham, Jr., Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas H. Schall, it is ordered that Roemer A. Brown, Esquire, and A. X. Schall, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles L. Bailey it is ordered that Sherman Mor-

New York; Andrew J. Cobb, Jr., Esq
Los Angeles, State of California; Geo
Baugh, Esquire, of Grand Forks, St
North Dakota; and Charles Marvin
of New York City be admitted to Prac
attorneys and counsellors of this Cour
they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the C
in this behalf by Ruth Letitia Stal
is ordered that Flora Warren Seym
of Chicago, State of Illinois; and B
A. Ball, Esquire, of Washington, Di
of Columbia) be admitted to practi
attorneys and counsellors at L this
and they were sworn accordingly.

On first made to the Court in
behalf by Mr. Edward M. Clear
ordered that Paul Overton, Esquire
Los Angeles, State of California be
mitted to practice as an attorney
counsellor of this Court and he wa
accordingly.

On motion first made to the C
this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler
ordered that H. R. Ehrmanntraut, E
of Washington, District of Columbia
David K. Stansbury, Esquire of C

as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Forney Johnston it is ordered that William Augustus Benson, Esquire, of Birmingham, State of Alabama be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William R. Kirby it is ordered that Benjamin Albert Greathouse, Esquire, of San Antonio State of Texas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. F. Staley, it is ordered that George A. Wells, Esquire of Grand Forks, State of North Dakota be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Levi Cooke, it is ordered that E. Butler Moulton

Island be admitted to Practice as an attorney & counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Oscar R. Houst it is ordered that Van Vechten Veeder, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to Practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Rufus S. Day it is ordered that Albert E. Powell, Esq. of Cleveland, State of Ohio; and Arthur C. Moore, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California be admitted to Practice as an attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Warren Gard, it is ordered that Robert J. Sh Esquire of Hamilton, State of Ohio admitted, to Practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Monday, October 6th 1919, continued:

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Eugene C Brown it is ordered that Carlos P. Griffin, Esquire of San Francisco, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Columbus Ewalt it is ordered that Park B. Blair, Esquire and Barton H. Blair, Esquire, of Mt. Vernon, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Stanley W. Willis it is ordered that Albert A. Kidder, Jr., Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Justin Morrill Chamberlin it is ordered that Louis Addison Dent, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to prac-

of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. Garland S. Ferguson, Jr., it is ordered that Asa B. Kimbell, Esquire, of Greensboro, State of North Carolina be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. Oscar Kent, it is ordered that Lin McDuce, Esquire) of ~~New Orleans~~ Chicago, of ~~Louisiana~~ Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William S. it is ordered that Claude B. Hudson, Esquire), of El Paso; Ben G. Oneal, Esquire, of Wichita Falls; Fritz G. Lanham, Esquire) of Fort Worth; and Lucian Parrish, Esquire) of Henrietta, State of Texas be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles D. Wilson, it is ordered that Howard Benton Lewis, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas H. McKeown it is ordered that Fred P. Lieuallen, Esquire, of Fort Worth, State of Texas; James A. Bass, Esquire, of Ardmore; Clinton A. Galbraith, Esquire, of Ada, and P. P. McVay, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas J. Walsh, it is ordered that Frank W. Haskins, Esquire of Butte, State of Montana be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wade H. Ellis

of Upper Sandusky, State of
be admitted to practice as a
ney and counsellor of this Cou
he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to th
in this behalf by Mr. William C
ted it is ordered that Edward
Jacobs, Esquire, of Globe, State
Arizona be admitted to practic
and attorney and counsellor of
Court, and he was sworn, acco

On motion first made to th
in this behalf by Mr. George Smith
it is ordered that Edwin Glion Bu
Esquire), of St. Louis, State of
ouri; be admitted to practice
attorney and counsellor of this
and he was sworn accordingly

On motion first made to
Court in this behalf by Mr. A
wether Smith it is ordered that F. M. M
Esquire), of Newport State of Ma
and John Abdul Smith, Esquire
Member, State of Colorado, be ad
to practice as attorneys and co
sellors of this Court, and he wa
sworn accordingly.

Monday, October 6th 1919, continued.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Stanton G. Peelle, it is ordered that Paul M. Black, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. A. Eggleston it is ordered that James A. Keown, Esquire, of Alhambra, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motions first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Attee Pomerene it is ordered that J. Spriggs McMahon, Esquire, of Dayton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court; and he was sworn accordingly.

Ex Parte In the Matter of The United States, Petitioner. — Orig. — The motion for leave to file petition for writs of mandamus and prohibition was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sol-

Monday, October 6th, 1919, continued.

The United States, Appellant,
vs.
The Quaker Oats Company et al.

Leave granted to substitute full printed copies of testimony used in lower court, and case passed to be retained to the call pursuant to the 26th Rule on motion of Mr. Solicitor General King, for the appellant.

114

Ash Sheet Company, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States

285

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the defendant in error.

The United States of America, ex rel., Kansas City Southern Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The Interstate Commerce Commission)

113

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the defendant in error.

The United States

Monday, October 6th 1919, continued.

---

458 (Plaintiff in Error,) The motion to
vs. advance this
Standard Brewery, Inc. cause was sub-
mitted to the con-
sideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor Gen-
eral King for the (Plaintiff in Error.)

Charles Glen Collins, The motion to
(Appellant,) advance this cause
350 vs. was submitted to
Frank M. Miller, U.S. the consideration
Marshal, etc., of the Court by
Mr. Solicitor Gen
eral King for the (Appellee.

The Atherton Mills, The motion to ad-
(Appellant.) vance this cause
406 vs. was submitted
Eugene P. Johnston to the considera-
et al. tion of the Court
by Mr. Solicitor
General King for the (Appellees.

J. Hartley Manners, The motions to
(Petitioner,) advance and
370 vs. place this cause
Oliver Morosco. on the summary
docket was sub
mitted to the consideration of the Court
by Mr. Alex. C. King in behalf of Mr.

and Mr. William J. Hughes for the petitioner in support of the motion and by Mr. Charles H. Tuttle for the respondent in opposition thereto.

527 Lewis A. Stebbins, Petitioner vs. A. Selig. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. H. Kiare, Mr. L. A. Stebbins and Mr. X. O. Pindall for the petitioner and by Mr. Thomas S. Buzbee and Mr. George B. Pugh, for the respondent.

168 Joseph N. Nichols, Appellant, vs. The United States. The motion to remand this cause for further findings was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry J. Gerrity for Mr. L. P. Michener & Mr. William E. Russell for the appellant, and by Mr. Asst. Attorney General Davis for appellee.

384 W. M. Hardy et al., Petitioners vs. The United States of America. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the

Monday, October 6th 1919, continued.

William N. Atwell, and Mr. J. N. Ramsey, Jr., for the Petitioners and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Brown for the respondent.

No — G. D. Bryant et al, Petitioners vs. The United States of America.

The motion to direct the Clerk of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit to certify and forward to this Court original transcript of record, and that the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be filed, submitted by Mr. William N. Atwell for the Petitioners.

175 Armour & Company, et al, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Company et al,

The motion to dismiss or affirm herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Levi Cooke in behalf of Mr. George N. Huddy, Jr., and Mr. Edward G. Buckland for the defendants in error in support of the motion and by Mr. Eugene A. Kingman for the plaintiffs

Monday, October 6th 1919, continued.

538 Clay Arthur Pierce et al, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The United States of America. The Petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Levi Cooke in behalf of Mr. Samuel W. Dordy et Jr., for the defendants, and an extension of time granted in which to print the record.

459 Concrete Steel Company, Petitioner vs. George E. Vanderburg. The Petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas F. Johnston for the petitioner and by Mr. Carlos C. Griffin for the respondent.

495 The Antero & Look Park Reservoir Company, et al., Petitioners, vs. Gas Securities Company et al, The Petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. H. Pritchett and Irving B. Melville for the petitioners and by Mr. Platt Rogers for the respondent.

230 C. C. Dah & Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Iowa. The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. M. Haines for the plaintiff in error.

526 Forged Steel Wheel Company, Petitioner vs. C. G. Jewell, Collector of Internal Revenue, &c. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George Sutherland, Mr. George B. Gordon and Mr. William Watson Smith for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Frierson for the respondent.

525 North Brothers Company, Petitioner vs. Ephraim Lederer, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. H. Winterstein for the petitioners and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Frierson for the Respon-

Carbon Steel Company,
Petitioner
535 vs.
C.E. Jewellen, Collector of Internal Revenues, &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick de C. Faust for the petitioner, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Pierson for the respondent.

North Brothers Company,
Petitioner,
525 vs.
Ephraim Lederer, Collector of Internal Revenue
and
Forged Steel Wheel Co.,
Petitioner,
526 vs.
C.E. Lewellyn, Collector of Internal Revenue, &c.

Leave granted to Curtis & Company Manufacturing Co to file suggestions herein on motion of Mr. E. G. Curtis in that behalf.

Leave granted to the Dayton Brass Castings Company of Dayton, Ohio, to file brief herein, on motion of Mr. J. Scrigg McMahon in that behalf.

National Can Company,
Petitioner
439. vs.
Chas. S. Bellows,

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the

Court by Clement R. Stickney for the petitioner and by Mr. William R. Moss for the respondent.

381 Houston Oil Company of Texas, (Petitioner) vs. Mrs. M. J. Brown.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank Spindle in behalf of Mr. Thomas M. Kennerly and Mr. H. O. Head, for the petitioner.

402 The Yazoo & Mississippi Valley Railroad Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The City of Clarksdale.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Blewett Lee, Mr. Charles N. Burch and Mr. H. H. Minor for the plaintiffs in error and by Mr. Gerald Fitz Gerald for the defendant in error in opposition thereto.

421 Charles A. Hitchcock, (Petitioner) vs.

The motion to dismiss this cau
was submitted to the consideration o
Court by Mr. Simon Lyon in be
of Mr. Francis R. Brackett for the
pondent in support of the motion
by Mr. Horace L. Gray for the pe
in opposition thereto.

John M. Prothingham
et al., &c.,
Appellants,
201. vs.
The United States.

Appeal fr
the Court o
Claims.

This cause having been called to
attention of the Court by Mr. Simon
Lyon, of counsel for the appellants
he having moved the Court to dismi
this appeal,

Therefore, in pursuance of said m
it is now here ordered, adjudged and
decreed by this Court, that this appea
be, and the same is hereby dismissed

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

J. M. Thompson,
Master &c.,
Petitioner
391 vs.
Peter Lucas et al.

The motion to
vance this cau
was submitted
to the consideration
of the Court by
Charles Warren

in behalf of counsel for the petitioner.

276 of Oct. Term, 1919. Richard N. Adams, individually, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Richard N. Adams, Executor &c., — The petition to amend proceedings in the proceedings for certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Henry Butler in behalf of Mr. Hollis R. Bailey for the petitioner.

415 Philadelphia & Reading Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Margaret L. Naudcock — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George Gowen Parry and Mr. Charles Neebner for the plaintiff in error in support of the motion and by Mr. Hannis Taylor for the defendant in error in opposition thereto. The submission of the motion to dismiss herein was postponed until Monday, October 27th.

Kansas City, Mexico & Orient Railway Company of Texas,

232 vs. The United States.

The motion to ... mand this ca... for further fu... was submitted to the consideration of ... Court by Mr. A. Carter Pope for the ... pellant in support of the motion and ... Mr. Solicitor General King for the ap... in opposition thereto.

Frank O. Balcom, Petitioner

515 vs.

The United States of America.

The petition for ... writ of certio... herein was su... to the consideration ... of the Court by ... Jesse C. Adkins ... for the petitioner and by Mr. Assista... Attorney General Stewart and Mr. Ha... Ridgely for the respondent.

The Columbus Packing Company, Petitioner,

559 vs.

The State of Ohio on the relation of Hugo N. Schlesinger &c.

The petition ... a writ of ... certiorari ... in was s... mitted to ... consideration ... of the Cour... Mr. Ralph ... H. Bunnell ... for the petitioners and by Mr. Dimo... S. Hogan [and Fred C. Hoyt] for the respondent.

517. Crenshaw Brothers & Saffold, &c., Petitioner, vs. Southern Pacific Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward M. Cleary and Mr. L. D. Nat-field for the petitioner and by Mr. Henley C. Booth for the respondent.

501. Truman A. Ketchum Appellant, vs. Pleasant Valley Coal Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wade H. Ellis in behalf of Mr. Charles C. Hey & Mr. E. A. Walton for the appellant in support of the petition.

509. Colman & Company Petitioner vs. Delaware Company, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert S. Zold in behalf of Mr. Jacob J. Lesser for the petitioner and by Mr. Julius L. Peyser for the respondent.

305 The Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Com- (Damages)
vs.
Isabel M Johnson;
and
National Life Insurance Company of Montpelier, Vermont,

306 .....vs.
J. M. Miller, Admr, &c.

S. R. Prouty for Isabel M Johnson

The motion of certiora up the wh and caus was subm the consi of the Cou Mr. Ruf in behalf o George Lin George B. Y Insurance Co Damages and Isabel M Johnson

Pittsburgh, Chicago, Cincinnati & St Louis Railway Company, (Petitioner)

345. vs.
Ellsworth Globe.

The Petit a writ o orari hav submitting considera the Court Rufus S. in behalf of Mr Andrew Squire & M Thomas M. Kirby for the Petitioner by Mr. Albert E. Powell for the R ent.

Maryland Casualty Company, (Defendant

75

Monday, October 6th 1919, (continued.)

The United States. The motion to remand this cause for further proceedings was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Burt E. Barlow & Mr. A. R. Beeson for the appellant.

The United States of America Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
250 Josiah V. Thompson. The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. E. B. Cunningham and Mr. W. C. McKean for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Solicitor General King, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. W. C. Herron for the Plaintiff in Error in opposition.

The Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Company, Petitioner
vs.
131 J. Robert Summersville. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry B. Macfarland for the petitioner & by Mr. George E. Dill-

529

The Toledo & Ohio Central Railway Company, Petitioner vs. The Public Utilities Commission of Ohio.

The petition herein was submitted upon motion of Mr. Frederick for the petitioner by Mr. John

and Mr. N. B. Arnold for the respondent.

599 of Oct. Term 1918.

Minerals Separation, Limited et al., Petitioners, vs. Butte & Superior Mining Company,

The motion to recall the writ of certiorari herein was submitted upon motion of Thomas F. Sheridan, Mr. Thomas L. Chadbourne and Mr. Kunal R. Babbitt for the respondent in support of the motion with leave to file opposition within five days.

by Mr Thomas F. Sheridan, Mr. Bull, Mr Thomas L. Chadbourne Kunal R. Babbitt for the respondent in support of the motion with leave to file opposition within five days.

442

Standard Silk Dyeing Company, Petitioner vs. The Roessler & Hasslacher Company.

The petition for writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Hugh Gordon

and Mr. Homer S. Cummings for the petitioner, and by Mr. Garrard Glenn for the respondent.

454 Sarah Chandler Shapley, Petitioner vs. George M. Kline et al. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James A. Keown for the petitioner and by Arthur Mead Smith for the respondent.

450 James A. Keown, Petitioner vs. Julia E. Dudley et al. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James A. Keown pro se.

James A. Keown pro se.

420 James A. Keown, Petitioner vs. N. Francis Hayden, Administrator, &c. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James A. Keown, pro se.

Wysong & Miles

Monday, October 6th 1919, continued.

477 Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Planters' National Bank of Richmond, Virginia,
and
Wysong & Miles Company, et al.,

478 Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Bank of North America, Philadelphia, Pa.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas J. Jerome for the plaintiffs in error in support of the petitions, and by Mr. Garland S. Ferguson, Jr., and Ashbel B. Kimball for the defendants in error in opposition thereto. Leave granted counsel for the petitioner to file brief within ten days.

531 Charles B. Shaffer,
Appellant,
vs.
Frank C. Carter, State Auditor et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander Britton in behalf of counsel for the appellant.

Catherine Neidlinger,
as Administratrix
&c

Monday, October 6th 1919, continued.

433 (Petitioner) vs. Southern Pacific Company. The motion for an order directing the Clerk to file the petition for certiorari herein as of June 27th 1919, and petition for writ of certiorari was submitted to consideration of the Court by Mr. Stanley W. Willis and Mr. Theodore A. Bell, for the petitioner in support of the motion & petition and by Mr. Robert M. Morlin and Mr. William M. Morlin for the respondents in opposition to the same.

423 Chicago & Northwestern Railway Company, (Plaintiff in Error,) vs. Herman Van de Zande. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. N. Van Doren for the plaintiff in error in support of, the plaintiff in error.

72 } George A. Cole et al, (Petitioners)
73 } vs.
Joseph Ralph. The motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William G.

189.

Silver King Coalition Mines Company, (Petitioner)
vs.
Conkling Mining Company.)

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William G. Prentiss in behalf of Mr. Curtis N. Lindley, Mr. W. N. Dickson, Mr. A. C. Ellis, Jr., and Mr. Thomas Marioneaux for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward B. Critchlow, Mr. William McM. Hugh, Mr. William M. Ray and Mr. William N. King, for the respondent. Leave granted Mr. William G. Prentiss to file brief as amicus curiae.

175

National Surety Co, et al, (Petitioners,
vs.
The Commonwealth of Virginia) at the relation and for the benefit of Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hilton J. Lambert, Mr. J. J. Darlington, Mr. Rudolph N. Yeatman and Mr. Frank J. Hogan for the petitioners, and by Mr. Edgar Scott for the respondent.

Monday, October 6th 1919, continued.

Keith Lumber Company,
(Petitioner)
vs.
480 Houston Oil Company of Texas, et al.

The Petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles N. Bates in behalf of Mr. N. M. Garwood for the Petitioner.

The Houston & Texas Central Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
479 The City of Ennis et al.

On motion of Mr. Charles N. Bates in that behalf, leave is hereby granted to extend the time in which to submit Petition for a writ of certiorari herein until the record is printed.

Strathearn Steamship Company Ltd.,
Petitioner,
vs.
373 John Dillon.

This motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. N. L. Cheyney in behalf of Counsel.

George C. Biddle,

Monday, October 6th 1919, continued.

260 vs The United States. The suggestion of diminution of the record and motion for a writ of certiorari or to remand for additional findings, submitted by Mr Hauk S. Adleman for the appellant in support of the motion and by Mr. Solicitor General King for the appellee in opposition thereto.

James B. Roberts, Administrator, &c., Petitioner vs. Tennessee Coal, Iron & Railroad Company. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William A. Henson and Mr. Hannis Taylor for the petitioner

383

Gertrude Minnie Jones, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Max Hittscher. The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward H. Dittmann for the defendant in error in support of the same and by Mr. N. Marion Jones, Jr., for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

181

Monday, October 6th 1919, continued).

281 Canadian Northern Railway Company, Petitioner vs. Gus Eggen. The motion to dismiss or affirm or place on the summary docket in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Tom Davis and Mr. Ernest A. Michel for the respondent in support of the motion.

462 Erie Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. James John Hosier, for the use of John A. Chapman and Judson A. Stone. The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Murray Nelson and Mr. Cyrus Bentley for the defendant in error in support of the motion and by Mr. Mitchell D. Dollamore for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

462 Erie Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. James John Hosier, for the use of John The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consider-

Monday, October 6th 1919, continued.

Court by Mr. Mitchell W. Pollambee for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition and by Mr. Murray Nelson and Mr. Cyrus Bentley for the defendant in error in opposition thereto.

371

Samuel Curry Campbell,
Petitioner,
vs.
Maryland Casualty Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. N. King and Mr. Roswell King for the petitioner and by Mr. Walter L. Clark and Mr. William C. Prentiss for the respondent.

389

Isidore S. Hoskins et al,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lawrence B. Cohen for the plaintiffs in error in support of the petition and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the defendant in error in opposition thereto.

Erie Railroad Company,
Petitioner

Monday, October 6th 1919, continued.

396 Timothy Kirby vs. [illegible] — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Adelbert Moot for the petitioner and by Mr. Thomas C. Burke for the respondent.

Nordyke & Marmon Company, Petitioner vs. City of Indianapolis and N. Laurier Company, Petitioner vs. City of Indianapolis — 403 / 404 — The petition for writs of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clarence E. Weir and Mr. Charles A. Richards for the petitioners and by Mr. Samuel Ashby for the respondent.

William Hodge, Petitioner vs. The United States of America — 414 — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Irving M. Weir and Mr. Eustace Reynolds for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Monday, October 6th 1919, continued.

419 E. Hilton Jackson, Receiver, etc., (Petitioner, vs. John Lewis Smith et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. H. Milan for the petitioner and by Mr. Louis A. Dent for the respondent.

436 Interstate Business Men's Accident Association, Petitioner vs. Edith A. Lester.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Fred P. Carr and Mr. R. M. Haines for the petitioner and by Mr. Leonard S. Perry for the respondent.

440 Mrs. Nonie Morrison, Administratrix, etc., (Petitioner vs. Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John J. Vertrees for the petitioner and by Mr. John B. Keeble for the respondent.

Monday, October 6th 1919, continued.)

443 American Car & Foundry Company, Petitioner vs. Saroqia Rocha. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. F. Watts, Mr. William R. Gentry, Mr. John O. H. Pitney and Mr. John K. Nardin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas Bond for the respondent.

447 G. A. Tebbetts, Petitioner vs. The United States of America. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William N. Chapman for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

448 Edward O. Steger, et al., etc. Petitioner, vs. Mountford S. Orth. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the printed arguments by Mr. Addison S.

William J. Hughes for the petitioners and by Mr. Crigen S. Seymour and Mr. Alfred S. Barnard for the respondent.

452 Katherine Keever, widow etc.,
Petitioner
vs.
Philadelphia & Reading Coal & Iron Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Albert P. Massey for the petitioner and by Mr. Pierce, Mr. Brown for the respondent.

453 Parker Stennick, Trustee, etc.,
Petitioner
vs.
Willard N. Jones et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas Mannix for the petitioners.

463 Philip Chase,
Petitioner
vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benjamin M. Heinberg for the petitioner and by Mr. Solicitor

Monday, October 6th 1919, continued:

King for the respondent.

481 Puget Austin Dredging Company, Petitioners vs. Otto Marmur Coal & Mining Company. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lowrie G. Barton for the petitioner and by Mr. Charles N. Stephens for the respondent.

485 Erie Railroad Company Petitioner vs. Jacob Schleenbaker. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Paul Lamb for the petitioner and by Mr. C. N. Henkel for the respondent.

487 The Cudahy Packing Co., Petitioner, vs. Edward B. Pryor Receiver &c. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George P. Buckingham and Mr. Charles D. Pettmann for the petitioner and by Mr. H. D. McC

488 Anna Rust and William Rust, Petitioners vs. First National Bank of Sweetwater, Texas

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry C. Lobb for the petitioners.

490 Mutton A. Miller, as Collector of Internal Revenue, etc., Petitioner vs. Matilda M. Gearin.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Frierson for the petitioner and by Mr. John M. Gearin for the respondent.

498 The Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway, Petitioner vs. J. L. Austin

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Fitzgerald Hall for the petitioner and by Mr. Montague S. Ross for the respondent.

Monday, October 6th, 1919, continued

499 The Penn Mutual Life Insurance Company, Petitioner, vs. Abraham Lederer, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George Wharton Pepper for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

506 Edward White, Commissioner of Immigration, etc., Petitioner, vs. Chin Dong. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart for the petitioner.

507 Philadelphia & Reading Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Philadelphia, Germantown & Norristown The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Abra

for the Petitioner and by Mr. James Wilson Bayard for the respondent.

510 William A. Jamieson et al., trading as Jay Street Terminals, Petitioners, vs. Central Railroad Company of New Jersey et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Roger English and Mr. Dix W. Noel for the petitioners and by Mr. Samuel Park & Mr. Henry E. Mattson for the respondent.

511 Giuseppe Cavallaro, Petitioner vs. Steamship "Carlo Poma" etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Roger English and Mr. Oscar R. Houston for the petitioner and by Mr. Charles A. Burlingham and by Mr. Van Vechten Veeder for the respondent.

512 Prudential Insurance Company of America, Petitioner vs.

Monday, October 6th 1919, continued.

George W. Ragan, Administrator, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Marshall Bullitt for the petitioner and by Mr. Robert H. Vance for the respondents.

518

The L. L. Smith Company, et al., Petitioners
vs.
The Egmont Silk Machinery Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas F. Sheridan, Mr. George L. Wilkinson and Mr. Walter W. Scott for the petitioners and by Mr. John C. Sturgeon for the respondent.

528

The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner,
vs.
Industrial Commission of Illinois et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas F. Little Page and Mr. Sidney F. Wilcox for the petitioner.

Monday, October 6th 1919, continued

536 Stark Bros. Nurseries & Orchards Company, Petitioner vs. William P. Stark et al.

The Petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. B. Remick, for the Petitioner.

539. The New York, Chicago & St. Louis Railroad Company, Petitioner vs. Clinton D. Pugh.

The Petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. [illegible] Skinner for the Petitioner, [illegible]

542. The City of New York, Petitioner, vs. Consolidated Gas Company.

The Petition for a writ of certiorari herein was was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William P. Burr the Petitioner, with leave to Mr. A. V. Kenney to file brief for the respondent within three days.

Benjamin Prudman, Petitioner.

Monday, October 6th 1919, continued.)

546 vs. The United States of America. The Petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benjamin Dried-man, pro se, and by Mr. Solicitor General King for the respondent.

Raymond A. Kelly, Administrator, &c., Petitioner, vs. Herbert B. McKeown. The Petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Francis Kelly for the petitioner and by Mr. Raffood N. Jayne for the respondent.

550

Postal Telegraph-Cable Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. City of Wilkes-Barre. In error to the Superior Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

107

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ

same is hereby dismissed with costs.
Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Marion Caldwell, as
State Supervisor of
Oil Inspection for the
State of Indiana,
Appellant,
246 vs.
The Moore Oil Company
et al.

Appeal from the
District Court of
the United States
for the District
of Indiana.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.
Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Frank E. Low,
Plaintiff in Error,
255 vs.
K. Sugawa & Company, Ltd.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Monday, October 6th 1919, continued.

Wherefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

275 Arkansas Central Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. M. L. Goad. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

608 J. K. Lumber Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. E. C. Ash. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

It appearing to the Court that a mo-

to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

398

Great Lakes Dredge & Dock Company, Petitioner, vs. Eastern Steamship Corporation.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Alabama & Vicksburg Railway Company, The Louisiana and Mississippi Railroad Manufac-

Monday, October 6th 1919, continued.

Company, Joseph Hirsh, Robert L. Kent and Moses D. Landau,
Plaintiffs in Error
vs.
H. H. Beard.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

No. 128

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed;

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Alabama & Vicksburg Railway Company et al.
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
H. H. Beard.

No. 128

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiffs in Error to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari herein has been filed,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Monday, October 6th, 1919. (continued)

The Chief Justice announced that, owing to the illness of the President of the United States, the usual visit to him will not be made; and that the Court will receive motions for admission to the bar and other motions noticed for today, and which are ready for submission; and that the call of the docket will commence tomorrow pursuant to the 26th rule.

Proclamations being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, October 7th, 1919.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Frear it is ordered that Clarence J. Hartley, Esquire, of Superior, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David A. Baer, it is ordered that Seldon N. O'Brien, Esquire of Manila, Philippine Islands

and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Simon Lyon, it is ordered that William J. Leary, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of the Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. V. Lindabury it is ordered that William H. Corlett, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
G. H. Bolin.

544

The motion for an extension of time within which to print transcript of record was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Kenneth D. McKellar in behalf of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

The City of Chicago et al,
Plaintiffs in Error,

Tuesday, October 7th 1919, continued.

90 vs. Thomas E. Kemp, as Chairman, etc., et al. The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mrs. Edward J. Brundage, Mr. James N. Wilkerson and Mr. George T. Buckingham for the defendants in error in support of the motion and by Mr. Samuel A. Ettelson and Mr. Chester E. Cleveland for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Road Improvement District No. 1, of Prairie County, Arkansas. 366 The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas S. Buzbee, Mr. George B. Pugh, Mr. J. G. Gamble and Mr. W. D. Dickson for the plaintiffs in error.

Missouri Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Monroe County Road 367 The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted

sideration of the Court by Mr. Roy Pace, Mr. Thomas S. Buzbee, Mr. George B. Pugh, Mr. J. G. Gamble and Mr. H. D. Hickinson for the plaintiffs in error in support of the petition.

117. The Virginian Railway Company, Petitioner vs. Vernon Halsted, who sues by Nora Halsted, his next friend. Petitioner.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter H. Taylor for the

421. American Steel Foundries, Petitioner vs. James D. Newton, Commissioner of Patents.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George L. Wilkinson for the petitioner.

429. Joseph M. Coldwell, Petitioner vs. The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walt

(Tuesday, October 7th 1919, continued)

Nelles for the petitioner, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

130 Wilhelm Schumann, Petitioner
vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. N. Vaulaw for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

132 Clarence M. Turner, Petitioner
vs.
Fred E. Turner.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. A. Davidson and Mr. Preston C. West for the petitioner and by Mr. Richard H. Stoutz, Mr. J. M. Zevely and Mr. J. M. Swenk for the respondent.

The United States of America,
Appellant

Tuesday October 7th 1919 continued.)

1. Lehigh Valley Railroad Company et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Attorney General Palmer, Mr. Solicitor General King, for the appellant and by Mr. Edgar A. Bolles, Mr. Elihu Root Jr., Mr. E. V. B. Getty, Mr. Nicholas A. Hacker, Mr. John Hampton Barnes, and Mr. Allan McCulloch for the appellees.

5 City of Birmingham, Plaintiff in Error, vs. M. J. O'Connell.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed argument by Mr. Joseph P. Mudd for the plaintiff in error. No brief filed for the defendant in error.

7 Eastman Kodak Company et al., Appellants, vs. The United States of America. Appellee.

This cause was passed pursuant to the 26th rule on motion of Mr. Solicitor General King for the

Tuesday, October 7th, 1919, (continued).

Adams State Bank,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
8 The People of the State of Illinois.

This cause was passed per stipulation of counsel.

Associated Bill Posters & Distributors &c., et al,
Appellants
vs.
11 The United States.

This cause was continued per stipulation of counsel and on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Kuig for appellee.

The Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Railway Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
2 Alvin J. Dink.

This cause was argued by Mr. William M. Matthews for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Roy L. Fitzgerald for the defendant in error.

The United States of America,
Appellant
vs.
3 Reading Company et al;

(Tuesday, October 7th, 1919, continued.)

Reading Company et al., Appellants,
4 vs.
The United States of America.

The reargument of this cause was commenced by Mr Solicitor General King for the United States continued by Mr. Jackson E. Reynolds for the Reading Company, by Mr. Robert H. McForest for the Central Railroad Company of New Jersey, and concluded by Mr. Solicitor General King for the United States.

The United States of America, Appellants,
6 vs.
United States Steel Corporation et al.

On motion of Mr. C. B. Ames for the appellants, 6 hours were allowed to each side for this rearguments, and counsel granted leave to argue for appellees in their causes. The rearguments was commenced by Mr. C. B. Ames for the appellants.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Wednesday, October 8th 1919 —

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General King, it is ordered that Vincent K. Rothwell, Esquire, of New York City, and Herbert N. Leech, Esquire, of Clarksville, State of Tennessee be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Daniel Thew Wright it is ordered that Lewis F. Hale, Esquire of Bellefontaine, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and

accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Allen Pomeroy it is ordered that Charles E. McCarthy, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, it is ordered that S. Burnell Bragg, Esquire, of Norfolk, and George E. Allen, Esquire, of Victoria, State of Virginia be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tracy L. Jeffords, it is ordered that George Keck, Esquire and Albert Ecke, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph O. Sullivan, it is ordered that Clarence A. Lindeman

be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn according ly.

12 The United States, Appellant. vs. American Can Company et al. Appellant.

This cause was passed pursuant to the 26th Rule on motion of Mr. Solicitor General King for the

13 William J. Hogarty, County Fire Com'r, vs. Philadelphia & Reading Railway Company.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Alexander Simpson, Jr., for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. William Clarke Mason and Mr. Charles Heebner for the defendant in error.

29 The United States, Petitioner vs. William B. Poland et al.

This cause was passed pursuant to the 26th Rule on motion of Mr. Solicitor General King

for the Petitioner

Wednesday, October 8th 1919, continued.

6 The United States of America, Appellant, vs. United States Steel Corporation et al. Appellees.

The reargument of this cause was continued by Mr. C. B. Ames for the appellant and by Mr. Richard V. Lindabury for

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Thursday, October 9th 1919.—

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today, at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices

Frank K. Green Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General King, it is ordered that William T. Baskett, Esquire of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. A. Severance it is ordered that William D Bailey, Esquire, of Duluth, State of Minnesota be admitted to practice as an attorney and coun-

(Thursday, October 9th 1919, continued.)

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. C. C. Calhoun, it is ordered that Matthew B. Jones, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, it is ordered that Charles S. Haskill, Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The New Orleans Land Company,
Appellant,
472 vs.
Leader Realty Company, Limited.

Hart and Mr. Charles Louque for the Appellant.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. O.

Pacific Gas & Electric Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
81 vs.
The Police Court of the

City of Sacramento, State of California, et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court upon stipulation by Mr. William B. Bosley for the plaintiff in error, brief for the defendants in error to be filed within thirty days, and reply brief for the plaintiff in error to be filed within twenty days thereafter, on motion of Mr. Alexander Britton in that behalf.

Oklahoma Gin Company, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The State of Oklahoma;
and
The Oklahoma Operating Company,
Appellant,
vs.
J. E. Love et al, etc.

32.

29.

These causes were submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. C. B. Ames for the plaintiff in error and appellant by appellant, and by Mr. S. P. Freeling for the defendant in error and appellee, and by Mr. Paul A. Walker for the defendant in error in No. 32.

Franklin K. Lane,

34 et al., Appellants,
vs
Central Pacific Rail
way Company,

26 on motion of Mr. Solicitor General
for the appellants.

The United States of
America),
Appellant,
6 vs.
United States Steel
Corporation et al.

for the appellant; and by Mr. Reed for the appellees.

This cause was
passed to be
restored to the
call pursuan
section 9 of R

This reargumen
of this cause
continued by
Richard V. Li
bury for the a
Appellees, by Mr.
Henry E. Colto
Mr. Howard

(Proclamation being made, the Court is a
journed until tomorrow at twelve o'clock)

Friday, October 10th, 1919 - - -

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Associate Justices

(Frank K. Green, Esquire), Marshal).
(James D. Maher, Clerk.)

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. D. Michener, it was ordered that Maurice D. Heinshenk, Esquire), of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to (practice) as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

M. Hampton Todd
et al, Receivers, &c.,
425 Petitioners

Friday, October 10th 1919, continued

Heulings Lippincott et al., receivers &c., (The petition a writ of orari facias submitted) to the) consideration of the by Mr. J. N. Burton for the petit by Mr. Henry P. Brown for the resp

The Northern Pacific Railway Company, (Appellant

35 vs.

(Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior.

The United States of America, (Appellant,

6 vs.

The United States Steel Corporation et al.

C. A. Severance for the appellees and cluded by Mr. C. B. Ames for the A

The Bank of Oxford et al., (Plaintiffs in Error,

9 vs.

J. S. Love et als., Bank Examiner of the State

Friday, October 10th 1919, continued.

of Mississippi. This cause was argued by Mr. P. D. Evans for the plaintiffs in error and by Mr. Earle N. Boyd for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday next, at twelve o'clock.

Monday, October 13th 1919

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John P. Leahy it is ordered that John V. Lee, Esquire, and Ernest A. Oakley, Esquire of St. Louis, State of Missouri be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William St. John Boze, it is ordered that Henry Buist, Esquire, of Charleston, State of South

Monday, October 13th, 1919, continued.

Carolina be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roger S. Wykes it is ordered that Leland M. Carr, Esquire of Lansing, State of Michigan be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wellington R. Hare, it is ordered that Ronald F. Melhorn, Esquire, of Columbus, and R. Clint Cole, Esquire of Findley, State of Ohio be admitted to practice as attorneys of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. B. Olbrich it is ordered that John J. Blaine, Esquire of Madison, State of Wisconsin be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Levi H. Ward

way, Esquire) of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John L. Kuhn it is ordered that Maurice Koehler, Esquire, and Hugh Brewster, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and William Howard Hill, Esquire, of Williamsport, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. C. Aiken it is ordered that William N. Foster, Esquire, of Syracuse, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. M. Bailey it is ordered that William Neely Bonner, Esquire, of Wichita Falls, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Monday, October 13th 1919 continued.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John E. Laskey, it is ordered that William E. Leahy, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and Horace P. Smith, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Andrew J. Cook, Jr., it is ordered that George L. McKeeby, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. Jesse C. Adkins, it is ordered that Fred Barth, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General King, it is ordered that Henry S. Mitchell, Esquire of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an

Monday, October 13th, 1919, continued.

and he was sworn accordingly.

Richard N. Dana, Individually, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
276 of Oct. Term 1918. Richard N. Dana, Executor et al., &c.

On consideration of the motion to Stay the mandate and to amend the proceedings into proceedings on writ of certiorari herein,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Philip D. du Pont et al., Petitioners
vs.
1014 of Oct. Term, 1918. Pierre S. du Pont et al.

On consideration of the motion to reinstate the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

The State of New Mexico, Complainant
vs.
— Orig. The State of Colorado.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a bill of complaint herein, It is now here ordered

Monday, October 13th 1919, continued:

by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and process is ordered to issue returnable, March 1st. next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex Parte In the Matter of the United States, Petitioner. (Orig.)

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion for leave to file petition for writs of mandamus and prohibition herein be, and the same is hereby postponed for hearing with case No. 250.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Catherine Needlein, as Administratrix of the Estate of Francis J. Needlein, deceased. Petitioner, vs Southern Pacific Company. /133

On consideration of the motion for an order directing the Clerk to file the petition for writ of certiorari herein as of June 27th 1919.

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Company,

305 vs.

Isabel N. Johnson.

On consideration of this motion to bring up the entire record and cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

National Life Insurance Company of Montpelier, Vermont,

306 vs.

A. M. Miller, Administrator, etc.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Maryland Casualty Company,

Appellant,

73 vs.

The United States.

On consideration of the motion to remand this cause to the Court of Claims for further findings of fact,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Joseph A. Nicholas

Appellant,

168 vs.

The United States.

On consideration of the motion to remand this cause to the Court of Claims

Monday, October 13th 1919, continued.

for findings of fact.

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the Court of Claims is directed to set aside its judgment and reopen the case for further testimony and to make additional findings of fact.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Kansas City, Mexico & Orient Railway Company of Texas, Appellant, vs. The United States. 232

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of this motion to remand this cause for further findings of fact be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

George A. Beidler, Appellant, vs. The United States. 260

On consideration of this motion for a writ of certiorari herein or to remand this cause for further findings of fact.

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same

Monday, October 13th, 1919, continued.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

George A. Cole et al., Petitioners, vs. Joseph Ralph. 172 & 173

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, December 8th, next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Pennsylvania Gas Company, Plaintiff in error, vs. Public Service Commission, Second District of the State of New York, et al. 330

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 8th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Charles Glen Collins, Appellant, vs. Frank M. Miller, U.S. Marshal, etc. 350

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is

Monday, October 13th 1919, continued.

by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 8th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.)

373 Strathearn Steamship Company, Limited, Petitioner vs. John Dillon. (On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 8th next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.)

391 J. M. Thompson, Master & Claimant of the Steamship "Westmeath" &c., Petitioner vs. Peter Lucas et al. On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 8th after the cases here-

Monday, October 13th, 1913 continued

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

406 The Atherton Mills, Appellant, vs. Eugene N. Johnston et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 8th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

413 The United States of America, at the relation of Kansas City Southern Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Interstate Commerce Commission.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 8th after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, October 13th 1919, continued.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
458 Standard Brewery ~~Company~~, Incorporated.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 8th next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Charles B. Shaffer, Appellant,
vs.
531 Frank C. Carter, State Auditor, etc., et al.

On considerations of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 8th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ash Sheep Company, Plaintiff in Error,
85

Monday, October 13th 1919, continued.

The United States of America. On consideration of the motion to advance this cause for argument with case No. 212, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

J. Hartley Manners, Petitioner vs. Oliver Morosco. 370 On consideration of the motion to advance this cause and place the same on the Summary docket, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Gertrude Minnie Jones, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Max Hoffscher. 181 It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, October 13th 1919, continued.

250 The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Josiah V. Thompson.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

281 Canadian Northern Railway Company, Petitioner vs. Gus. Eggen.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

66 The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Road Improvement District No. 1, of Prairie County, Arkansas.

It is ordered by the Court that this further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the case on the writ of error.

367 Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, et al. Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Monroe County Road Improvement District et al.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby postponed until the hearing of the case on the writ of error.

(per Mr. Chief Justice White).

402 The Yazoo & Mississippi Valley Railroad Company, et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The City of Clarksdale

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby postponed until the hearing of the case on the writ of error.

(per Mr. Chief Justice White).

419 E. Hilton Jackson, Receiver, etc., Petitioner vs. John Lewis Smith et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

American Steel Foundries, Petitioner
vs.
James D. Newton, Commissioner of Patents.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

121

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Daniel Curry Campbell, Petitioner

Monday, October 13th 1919, continued.

Maryland Casualty Company, vs. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereon had; as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Houston Oil Company of Texas, Petitioner vs. Mrs. M. J. Brown of the State of Texas. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Ninth Supreme Judicial District.

381

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Ninth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

Monday, October 13th 1919, continued.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

383 James B. Roberts, Administrator, etc., Petitioner vs. Tennessee Coal, Iron & Railroad Company. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

84 W. M. Hardy et al., Petitioners vs. The United States of America. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of

as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

389 Isidore S. Workin et al, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The United States of America. On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon, had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

396 Erie Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Timothy Kirby. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court, Appellate Division, Third Department, State of

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, to the Supreme Court, Appellate Division, Third Department, State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

403

Nordyke and Marmon Company, Petitioner,

vs.

City of Indianapolis,

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Superior Court of Marion County, State of Indiana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court of Marion County, State of Indiana, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, October 13th, 1919, (continued)

1011 N. Lauter Company, Petitioner vs. City of Indianapolis — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Superior Court of Marion County, State of Indiana

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court of Marion County, State of Indiana, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by the Court, that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1114 William Hodge, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel, thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, October 3rd, 1904. (continued).

417

The Virginian Railway Company, Petitioner,
vs.
Vernon Halstead, who sues by Nora Halstead, his next friend.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

420

James A. Keown Petitioner
vs
Francis Hayden, Administrator of the Estate of Anne Regan, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts, and of the argument

Monday, October 13th 1919, Continued

now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Chicago & Northwestern Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Norman Van de Zande. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

423

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Joseph M. Coldwell, Petitioner vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

429

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for First Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereon, it

Monday, October 13th 1913 (continued)

Post of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1430 Wilhelm Shumann, Petitioner
vs.
The United States of America.

On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

1431 The Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company, Petitioner
vs.
J. Robert Sommerville.

On Petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

Monday, October 13th 1919, continued

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Clarence N. Turner,
Petitioner,
vs
Fred E. Turner.

432

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and of the argument of counsel as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Catherine Nuckolls, as Administratrix of the Estate of Francis J. Nuckolls, deceased,
Petitioner
vs

433

Monday, October 13th 1913, continued.)

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Interstate Business Men's Accident Association,
Petitioner
vs.
Edith A. Lester

436

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr Chief Justice White

Monday, October 13th, 1919, continued.

439	National Law Company, Petitioner, vs. Olin S. Fellows.	On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

440	Mrs. Lonie Morrison, Administratrix of James B. Sykes, deceased, Petitioner, vs. Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company.	On Petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this

Monday, October 13th 1919, (continued)

Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Standard Silk Dyeing Company
Petitioner,
vs.
The Roessler & Hasslacher Chemical Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

442

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

American Car and Foundary Company
Petitioner
vs.
Sarah Richards

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the

443

Eighth Circuit.

Monday, October 13th 1919, continued

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same; it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

447

G. A. Vedin,
Petitioner
v/s.
The United States
of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Edward O. Steger, Charles E. Schaff, George W. Armstrong and George A. Carden, composing the firm of Steger & Company

Monday, October 13, 1919, continued.)

Petitioners,
vs.
448 Montford S. Orth.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

See Mr. Chief Justice White.

James A. Kerwin,
Petitioner
vs.
450 Julia E. Prudo
et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Superior Court of the State of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court of the State of Massachusetts and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

See Mr. Chief Justice White.

Parker Stennick,
Trustee in Bankruptcy
for the Hamilton Creek
Lumber Company and
The Ranier Lumber and
Shingle Company,
Petitioner
vs.
Willard N. Jones, Rud
A. Kribs, and The J.K.
Lumber Company.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

453

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel in support of the same it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

454

Sarah Chandler Shipley,
Petitioner
vs.
George M. Kline, Elmer A.
Stevens and Henry M. Pollock
of Massachusetts.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme

Monday, October 13th 1919, continued.

Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Concrete Steel Company, Petitioner
vs.
459 George E. Vanderbrugh.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Phil. P. Chase,
Petitioner

The United States of America.—

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and of the arguments of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Sue Ershine Newman, administratrix, etc., et al.
Appellants,
vs.
85 Ida M. Moyers et al;
and
William G. McAdoo, Secretary of the Treasury, et al.,
Appellants,
vs.
86 Robert L. Demes, Administrator, etc.

Motion to substitute as ones of the Appellants Carter Glass, present Secretary of the Treasury, in place of William G. McAdoo, former Secretary of the Treasury, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General

Monday, October 13th, 1919, continued:

appellants, and the motion granted.

122 Ricardo Cartas,
appellant
vs.
The United States.

The motions to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Solicitor General King, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Davis, and Mr. George M. Anderson for the appellee in support of the motion, and by Mr. George N. Lamar for the appellant in opposition thereto.

132 The Seaboard Air Line Railway Company,
appellant,
vs.
The United States;

33 The New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Company,
appellant
vs.
The United States;

Kansas City, Mexico

(Monday, October 13th, 1919, continued.)

232 Company of Texas, Appellant, vs. The United States. The motion to advance these cases to be heard with case No. 109, when the latter case is reached, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the appellees.

358 Silverthorne Lumber Company, Inc., et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The United States of America. The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the defendant in error.

556 Seaboard Air Line Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Baltimore Trust Company et al. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander King in behalf of Mr. Jack J. Spalding for the petitioner and by Mr. Bryan Cumming and Mr. Joseph B. Cumming for the respondent.

Monday, October 13th, 1919, continued.

335 Stephen N. P. Pell, et al., Appellants, vs. N. Gordon McCabe, Jr., et al.

The motion to dismiss on this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. William Henry Burt and Mr. Henry Burt for the appellees in support of the motion and by Mr. Emanuel J. Myers, Mr. Gordon St. John Rozer, S. P. Kleberg and Mr. Lindley M. Garrison for the appellants in opposition thereto.

519 Chauncey J. Hamlin et al., as surviving executors, etc., et al. Petitioners vs. Mary K. Wellington, individually and as Executrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lahue Brown on behalf of Mr. Dana B. Nellings for the petitioners, and by Mr. G. B. Wellington for the respondents.

665 White Oak Fuel Company, Petitioners, vs. Bertram W. Baxter

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration

Monday, October 13th, 1919, (continued)

Court by Mr. John P. Leahy and Mr. John V. Lee, for the petitioners.

219 Producers Transportation Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Railroad Commission of the State of California et al. — The joint motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lewis St. Andrews and Mr. Thomas L. Poland for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Douglas Bookman for the defendant in error.

401. Napa Valley Electric Company, Appellant, vs. Railroad Commission of the State of California et al. — The joint motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Milton U. Viren for the appellant and by Mr. Douglas Bookman for the appellee.

The Eastern Extension of the Australasia & China Telegraph Company, Limited, Appellant

Monday, October 13th, 1919, continued.

357 vs. The United States. The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Dutton Mr. Brylawski in behalf of Mrs. Louis Marshall for the appellant.

Mark Eisner, as collector, etc. Plaintiff in Error, vs. Myrtle H. Macomber. On motion of Mr. Charles Henry Butler in behalf of Mr. George W. Wickersham leave is hereby granted to file brief as amicus curiae in this cause.

318

Eugene M. Travis, as Comptroller of the State of New York, Appellant, vs. The Yale & Towne Manufacturing Company. The motions to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. Clarence Aiken for the appellant.

548

Knickerbocker Ice Company, Plaintiff in Error,

Lillian E. Stewart. The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. Clarence Aiken for the State Industrial Commission, with defendant in error.

International Bridge Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The People of the State of New York. 166

E. Clarence Aiken for the defendant in error. The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr.

The Arizona Copper Company, Limited, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Joseph B. Hammer and The Arizona Copper Company, Limited, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Richard Beaty. 20 of Oct. Terms 1918. 21 of Oct. Term 1918

Frank E. Curley for the defendants in error in support of the motion. The motion to recall mandates in these causes was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler in behalf of Mr. L. Kearney and Mr.

Monday, October 13th, 1919, continued.

Mr. John A. Garver and Mr. Ernest H. Lewis for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Hartford Life Insurance Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Rosa Barber.

196

The death of Rosa Barber, the defendant in error herein, suggested, and the appearance of Cecilia Blinco, administratrix of the estate of Rosa Barber, deceased, as defendant in error in this cause, filed and entered per stipulation of counsel and on motion of Mr. Henry G. Miller in behalf of counsel for the defendant in error.

Northern Pacific Railway Company,
Defendant,
vs.
The United States.

209

On motion of Mr. William R. Nash and Mr. Charles N. Bates, for the El Paso & Southwestern Railroad Company, et al, leave is hereby granted to file brief as amicus curiae in this cause.

George N. Blevins
Petitioner

33

Monday, October 13th, 1919, continued.

The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Nathaniel T. Green for the petitioner and by Mr. Solicitor General King for the respondent.

Erie Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
James John Hissey for the use of John A. Chapman et al.

462

The motion for leave to amend the petition for removal was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Fred Baetth in behalf of Mr. Mitchell H. Vollanebee for the petitioner and by Mr. Murray Nelson and Mr. Cyrus Bentley for the defendant in error.

Howard A. Showalter, Petitioner
vs.
The United States of America.

514

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John A. Howard for the petitioner.

Daniel O'Connell et al

Monday, October 13th, 1919, continued.

221 Plaintiff's in Error,
vs.
The United States of America.

This case was passed pursuant to the 26th Rule on motion of Mr. Solicitor General King for the defendant in error.

451 David Lamar and Henry B. Martin, Plaintiff's in Error,
vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. N. Zoline for the plaintiff's in error in support of the petition, and by Mr. Robert P. Stewart and Mr. Harry S Ridgely for the defendant in error in opposition thereto.

183 American Distributing Company, Petitioner
vs.
Hayes Wheel Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas E. Barkworth for the petitioner.

Monday, October 13th, 1919, continued.

492

Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioners
vs.
Anderson Gratz et al.
co-partners &c, et al.

The Petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander C. King, Mr. Edward R. Porter and Mr. Houston Thompson for the Petitioners and by Mr. Thomas D. Magner, for the respondents.

392

Frederick Schreiber et al, &c,
Petitioners
vs.
The German Evangelical Protestant Congregation of the Church of the Holy Ghost et al.

On Petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the Petitioners to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Monday, October 13th, 1919, continued)

The Hardin-Wyandot Lighting Company, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The Village of Upper Sandusky,

Hare for the defendant in error.

This cause was argued by Mr. N. C. Mathews for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. N. R.

10

Talbot Clarby Bragg, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
R. S. Weaver et al.

and by Mr. J. W. Hauk, defendant in error.

This cause was argued by Mr. George E. Allen for the plaintiff in error Jr., for the

22

J. S. Mullen et al, Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Malinda Pickens et al, and
L. V. Mullen et al, Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Anderson Gardner et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Fred R. Ellis for the plaintiffs in error. No appearance for the defendants in error.

25

26

Monday, October 13th 1919, continued.)

Central of Georgia Railway Company, (Plaintiff in Error,)
vs.
William A. Wright, Comptroller General, etc.

The pracequiment of this cause was commenced by Mr. P. M. Cunningham Jr, for the Plaintiff in error, and continued by Mr. Warren Grice for the defendant in error.

30

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, October 14th 1919 ——

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
(Frank K. Green, Esquire), Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

(Associate Justices.)

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. J. Wilson it is ordered that Clara B. Perrin, Esquire, of Iowa, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry K. Hickey it is ordered that Anthony J. Grasso, Esquire, of South Bend, State of

Tuesday, October 14th 1919, contin

as an attorney and counsellor of
Court, and he was sworn accordi

On motion first made to the
in this behalf by Mr. John S. B
it is ordered that Philip C. Stod
ney of Clarksburg, State of West
ginia be admitted) to practice a
attorney and counsellor of this C
and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to T
in this behalf by Mr. Thomas L. P
it is ordered that James S. Grish
gene of Sweetwater, State of Texa
admitted) to practice as an attorn
counsellor of this Court and he
sworn accordingly.

234 Clinton N. Pierce et al., (Plaintiff's Pain Error,
vs
The United States of America.)

This ca
passed
suant
26th
motion
Robert

ort for the defendant in error,

30 Central of Georgia Railway Company, (Plaintiff's Pain Error,
vs

Tuesday, October 14th 1919, continued)

William A. Wright Comptroller General, etc.

The Reargument of this cause was concluded by Mr. A. R. Lawton for the Plaintiff in error.

36 The United States on the relation of the Alaska Smokeless Coal Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior, et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Clem Burkhammer for the Plaintiff in error and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Nebeker for the defendant in error.

38 Lehigh Coal & Navigation Company, vs. The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. Henry S. Drinker, Jr. for Lehigh Coal & Navigation Company and by Mr. Henry S. Mitchell for the United States.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Wednesday, October 15th 1919.

Pursuant to adjournment this Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry Buist, it is ordered that George L. Buist Esquire, of Charleston, State of South Carolina be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wallace R. Lane it is ordered that Frederick H. Mason, Esquire of Chicago, State of Illinois, be

Wednesday, October 15th, 1919, (continued).

admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. A. Elston, it is ordered that Aaron Shapiro Esquire of San Francisco; O'Kelley Hardenbrook Esquire of Lompoc; and C. F. Reisker Esquire of Santa Maria; State of California be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom H. McKeown, it is ordered that E. A. Pearson, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

New York Scaffolding Company, Petitioner

vs.

Egbert Whitney;

37

New York Scaffolding Company,

47 vs. Libel-Bunnay Construction Company; and New York Scaffolding Company, Petitioners.

The appearances of George R. Whitney, as Administrator of the estate of Egbert Whitney, deceased, as a party respondent, filed and entered, on motion of Mr. Wallace R. Lane for the respondents.

48 vs. Chain Belt Company, et al.

These cases were passed pursuant to the 26th Rule on motions of Mr. Wallace R. Lane for the respondents.

The United States of America, Plaintiff-in-Error, 250 vs. Josiah V. Thompson.

This cause was passed pursuant to the 26th Rule on motion of Mr. Robert P. Stewart for the (plaintiff-in) error.

Ohio Valley Water Company, Plaintiff-in-Error, 128 vs. Ben Avon Borough et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. William Watson Smith and

Wednesday, October 15th 1919, continued.

Gordon for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Beene N. Evans and Mr. Leon and K. Guiler for the defendants in error.

254. Alex. J. Grosbeck et al., Appellants, vs. Duluth, South Shore & Atlantic Railway Company. by Mr. John E. Dacy, for the Appellees.

This cause was argued by Mr. Leland W. Carr and Mr. Roger S. Sykes for the Appellants and

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Thursday, October 16th 1919.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court, in their behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline it is ordered that Elmer Schlesinger, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court in their behalf by Mr. Rufus S. Day it is ordered that Robert P. Parrott, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to

(Thursday, October 16th 1919, continued.)

as an attorney and counsellor of this Court; and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. Frances M. Clement it is ordered that Earl L. Sackett, Esquire, of Sheridan, State of Wyoming, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Marvin Jones it is ordered that John Charles Hancock, Esquire, of Goldthwait, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Order: It is ordered that the bond of James H. Maher as Clerk of this Court, presented this day, be approved and recorded, and that the original of said bond be filed in the Department of Justice, pursuant to section 220 of the Judicial Code.

By Mr. Chief Justice White.

Which said bond was in words and figures following, viz:

Thursday, October 16th 1919, continued.

"Supreme Court of the United States.

Know all men by these presents, that we, James H. Maher, as Principal, and The Fidelity & Casualty Company of New York, as surety, are held and firmly bound unto the United States of America in the penal sum of Twenty Thousand Dollars ($20,000.00) lawful money of the United States of America, to be paid to the said United States of America or their certain attorney, to which payment, well and truly to be made, we bind ourselves, our and each of our heirs, executors, administrators and assigns, jointly and severally firmly by these presents.

Sealed with our seals and dated this 15th day of October, A. D. 1919.

Whereas, the above bounden James H. Maher, hath been appointed Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Now, therefore, the condition of the above obligation is such that if he, the said James H. Maher, shall faithfully discharge the duties of his said office, and seasonably record the decrees, judgments and determinations of the said Supreme Court of the United States then this obligation to be void, otherwise to remain in full force and virtue in law.

(Signed) James H. Maher (seal)

Thursday, October 16th 1919, continued.

The Fidelity & Casualty Company
of New York.
(signed) Henry C. Davis (Seal)
Attorney.

Signed, sealed and delivered in the presence
of:
(signed) G. A. Griffin
(signed) J. N. Vance.
Attest:
(signed) L. J. Howard,
Attorney.
Approved:
October 15th 1919.
(signed) Edward D. White,
Chief Justice of the
United States.
Premium $40.00
.72222.
(40¢ Internal Revenue
Stamps, cancelled)."

The People of the State of New York,
Complainant
vs.
The State of New Jersey et als.
3, Orig.

The report of James D. Maher, the Commissioner appointed to take additional testimony herein,

the order of this Court on March 10th 1919, was (presented) and the same was ordered to be filed).

The People of State of New York, Complainant, vs. The State of New Jersey et als. — It is ordered by the Court, that the testimony taken and returned by the Commissioner pursuant to the

3 Orig'l

order entered herein on March 10th 1919, be (opened, published and filed).

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Herman Theden et al, (Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The Union (Pacific Railroad Company.) — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

361

(It appearing to this Court that a motion of counsel for the (plaintiffs in error, to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed),

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Thursday, October 16th 1919, continued.

39 Takao Ozawa, vs. The United States

This cause was passed pursuant to the 26th Rule on motion of Mr. Solicitor General King for the United States

311 Stephen A. P. Bell, et al, Petitioners vs. A. Gordon McCabe, Jr., et al,

This cause was argued by Mr. Lindley M. Garrison for the petitioners and by Mr. William St. John Dozer and Mr. Henry Buist for the respondents.

16 Orig. State of Minnesota, Complainant vs. State of Wisconsin.

On motion of Mr. A. D. Bailey, five hours were allowed for the argument of this cause.

The argument was commenced by Mr. A. D. Bailey for the complainant and continued by Mr. A. B. Dreyberger for the complainant.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Monday, October 17th, 1919.—

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, it is ordered that Mrs. Oda Faulconer, of Los Angeles; Irving M. Walker, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, and E. Howard Roth, Esquire, of Camden, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas C. Bradley it is ordered that Edward [illegible]

gure) of St Louis, State of Missouri be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

40 The United States of America, Appellant, vs. Southern Pacific Company et al., Appellees. This cause was passed pursuant to the 16th Rule on motion of Mr. Solicitor General King for the Appellant.

41 J. Eugene Jordan, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Board of Medical Examiners of the State of Washington. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and the plaintiff in error having been three times solemnly by the Marshal to come into Court, and prosecute his writ of error, and failing to appear it is, therefore ordered in pursuance of the 16th Rule of this Court and on motion of Mr. Blackburn Esterline in behalf of counsel for the defendant in error

Friday, October 17th, 1919, continued

by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

State of Minnesota
Complainant.
16 Orig'l vs.
State of Wisconsin.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. N. B. Hylberger for the complainant, by Mr. M. B. Olbrich for the defendant and concluded by Mr. N. D. Bailey, for the complainant.

Mark Eisner, as
Collector, etc.,
Plaintiff in Error,
318 vs.
Myrtle N. Macomber

On motion of Mr. William L. Pierson, four hours were allowed for the reargument of this cause.

Reargument commenced by Mr. William L. Pierson for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at Twelve o'clock.

Monday October 20th 99

Pursuant to adjournment this Court met today at the Capitol.

Present.
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney, Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. Attorney General Palmer it is ordered that C. Raymond Beneinger, Esquire, of Stroudsburg, State of Pennsylvania, and Clement E. Dunlap, Esquire, of Augusta, State of Georgia be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court

King it is ordered that Joseph S. Lawton, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Frierson, it is ordered that Henry L. Goddard, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. Rufus S. Day, it is ordered that Hugh M. Bennett, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. Clement L. Bouvé, it is ordered that Henry Breckinridge, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and Henry Randolph Brigham, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Monday, October 20th 1919, continued.)

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Claude R. Porter, it is ordered that Emmet Dinley, Esquire, of Council Bluffs, State of Iowa be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn according ly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Peter Goelet Gerry, it is ordered that William N.S. Callahan, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

462 Erie Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. James John Hosier for the use of John W. Chapman et al). On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein and of the motion for leave to amend the petition for removal filed in the Court below,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said petition and said motion be, and the same are hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

462 Erie Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. James John Stacey for the use of John A. Chapman et al. In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

13 William J. Hogarty, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Philadelphia & Reading Railway Company. On consideration of this application consented to by the parties, to convert nunc pro tunc the writ of error herein into a writ of certiorari or to treat the writ of error as having the effect of a writ of certiorari,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said application be and the same

Monday, October 20th, 1919, (continued.)

is hereby denied.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.)

13 William J. Moriarty (Plaintiff in Error) vs. Philadelphia & Reading Railway Company. (In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.)

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.)

5 City of Birmingham (Plaintiff in Error) vs. W. J. O'Connell. (In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama.)

As the result of an intimation which has come to us through the Clerk, that at the time this case was submitted by both parties on printed briefs the defendant in error was dead

to inform us as to the fact of such death, and, if true, to state the considerations which have led them to assume that the action had not abated but was open to further prosecution.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

32 Oklahoma Gin Company, Plaintiff in error, vs. State of Oklahoma. — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

129 Oklahoma Operating Company, Appellant, vs. J. E. Love et al., etc. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma.

These cases having been submitted at this term without argument and upon briefs filed at the last term are ordered restored to the docket for oral argument to the end that there may be a compliance with the order which was made at the last term restoring them to the docket for reargument.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, October 20th 1919, continued.

Armour & Company, Swift & Company, Providence & Worcester Railroad Company, and C. C. Hall,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Company et al.

In error to the Superior Court of the State of Rhode Island.

175

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Superior Court of the State of Rhode Island and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Arizona Copper Company, Limited,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Joseph B. Hammer

No. 20 of Oct. Term 1918.

On considera-tion of the motion to recall the mandate and amend the judgment herein,

It is now here ordered by the Court

is hereby, denied.)

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

No 21, Oct. Term. 1918.

The (Arizona) Copper Company, Limited (Plaintiff in Error), vs. Richard Bray.

On consideration of the motion to recall the mandate and amend the judgment herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.)

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

472

The New Orleans Land Company, Appellant, vs. Leader Realty Company, Limited.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.)

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

132

Seaboard Air Line Railway, Appellant vs. The United States;

The New York Central

Monday, October 20th, 1919, continued.)

133 & Hudson River Railroad Company, (Appellant) vs. The United States; and Kansas City, Mexico & Orient Railway Company of Texas (Appellant; 232 vs. The United States. hereby, granted.) (See Mr. Chief Justice White)

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases for argument at the same time as case No. 109, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is

Silver Thorn Lumber Company, Inc., et al., (Plaintiffs in Error, 358 vs. The United States of America. paid) motion be, and the same is hereby granted), and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 8th, next, after the cases heretofore assigned, for that day.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that

(See Mr. Chief Justice White)

Monday, October 20th 1919, continued.)

919

Producers Transportation Company,
(Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The Railroad Commission of the State of California et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 8th next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

161

Nacoa Valley Electric Company,
Appellant,
vs.
The Railroad Commission of the State of California et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 8th next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, October 20th 1919, continues

The Eastern Extension, Australasia and China Telegraph Company, Limited,

Appellant,

357 vs.

The United States.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 8th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Eugene M. Travis, Comptroller of New York,

Appellant,

548 vs.

The Yale & Towne Manufacturing Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 8th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Knickerbocker Ice Company,

513 vs. Lillian E. Stewart. On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 8th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

(per Mr. Chief Justice White.

166 International Bridge Company, (Plaintiff in Error, vs. The People of the State of New York. On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court, that the said motion be and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 8th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

(per Mr. Chief Justice White)

489 Silver King Coalition Mines Company, (Petitioner, vs. Conkling Mining Company. On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for

Monday, October 20th, 1919, continued.

a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Penn Mutual Life Insurance Company, Petitioner, vs. Ephraim Lederer, Collector of Internal Revenue.

499

On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Monday, October 20th, 1919, continued.

Edward White, Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of San Francisco, Petitioner vs. Chin Ah Ong. (On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

506

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Giuseppe Cavallaro, Petitioner vs. Steamship "Carlo Poma" her engines, etc., Kingdom of Italy, Claimant. (On Petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

511.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereon had

Monday, October 20th, 1919, continued)

in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

525 North Brothers Company, Petitioner vs. Eugene Lederer, Collector of Internal Revenue for the First District of Pennsylvania. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and of this argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now hereby ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

526 Forged Steel Wheel Company, Petitioner vs.

of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-Third District of Pennsylvania.

Third Circuit.)

On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of, as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Carbon Steel Company,

Petitioners

vs.

535

C. G. Lewellyn, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-Third District of Pennsylvania.

On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and of the

Monday, October 20th 1919, continued.

of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White)

Stark Bros. Nurseries & Orchards Company, Petitioner vs. William P. Stark and William N. Stark, Trustees, etc. 536

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby granted.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.)

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner vs. 92

Benjamin Gratz,
co-partners doing
business under the
firm name and
style of Harris,
Jones & Gratz, et als.

On Petit
writ of c
to the U
States Ci
Court of
for the
Circuit.

On consideration of the Pe
for a writ of certiorari herein t
United States Circuit Court of
for the Second Circuit, and of
gument of counsel thereupon ha
well in support of as against t
it is now here ordered by this
that said Petition be, and the
is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice

Katherine Kewen, widow
of George Kewen,
Petitioner,
vs.
Philadelphia & Read-
ing Coal and Iron
Company.

452

On Peti
for writ
certiora
The Unit
States C
Court of
Seals fo
Second C

On consideration of the Pet
for a writ of certiorari herein to
United States Circuit Court of
for the Second Circuit, and of th
argument of counsel, thereupon

Monday, October 20th 1919, continued.

as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court, that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

475 National Surety Company, and Washington & Old Dominion Railway,

Petitioners

vs.

The Commonwealth of Virginia, who sues at the relation and for the benefit of the Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Hyson & Miles

1477 Kleumeier, J. R. Brown and Mrs. Fannie S. Wysong, as Executrix of O. C. Wysong, (Plaintiffs in Error) vs. Planters National Bank of Richmond, Virginia. On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied. Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1478 Wysong & Miles Company, J. A. Kleumeier, J. R. Brown and Mrs. Fannie S. Wysong, as Executrix of O. C. Wysong, (Plaintiffs in Error) vs. Bank of North America, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied. Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1480 Keith Lumber Company, Petitioner vs. Houston Oil Company of Texas et al. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth

Monday, October 20th 1919, continued

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Dreyer-Question Whether Mining Company

Petitioner

481 vs.

Otto Marmet Coal & Mining Company.

On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Erie Railroad Company

Monday, October 20th, 1919, continued.

485 vs. Jacob Schlumbaum. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petitions for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Anna Rust et al. William Rust. Petitioners,

488 vs. First National Bank of Sweetwater, Texas. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Monday, October 20th, 1919, continued.

Milton A. Miller, as Collector of Internal Revenue of the United States for the District of Oregon, Petitioner vs. Matilda M. Grain. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

490

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court, that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Antlers Lost Park Reservoir Company et al., Petitioners vs. Gas Securities Company et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

495

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals

ment of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway, Petitioner

498 vs.

L. J. Austin.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Thurman A. Ketchum, Appellant,

501 vs.

Pleasant Valley Coal Company and Guaranty Trust Company.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the

Monday, October 20th 1919, continued.

and the same is hereby, denied.
Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

507 Philadelphia & Reading Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Philadelphia Germantown & Norristown Railroad Company. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.
Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

509 Coleman & Company, Petitioner vs. Tawas Company, Inc. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the

for the Second Circuit. And of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

William A. Jamison, Catherine A. Jamison and Christina Arbuckle, trading as Jay Street Terminal,

Petitioners

vs.

Central Railroad Company of New Jersey et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

510

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court, that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, October 20th 1919, continued.

The Prudential Insurance Company of America, Petitioner
512. vs.
George A. Ragan, Administrator of Robert H. Nichols, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Frederick O. Balcom, Petitioner
515 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals of the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals

ment of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

517 Crenshaw Bros. & Safford a partnership, etc., Petitioners vs. Southern Pacific Company. On petition for writ of certiorari herein to the District Court of Appeals, Third Appellate District, State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the District Court of Appeals, Third Appellate District, State of California and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

518 The D. L. Smith Company et al. Petitioners vs. The Cement Tile Machinery Company. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth

Monday, October 20th 1919, continued.

cuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court, that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

527 Lewis A. Stebbens, Petitioner vs. A. D. Selig. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company.

528 vs. On Petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

Industrial Commission of Illinois, Katherine Krauzalis et al.

Illinois.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois and of the argument of counsel thereupon had ~~as well~~ in support of ~~or against~~ the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Toledo & Ohio Central Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. The Public Utilities Commission of Ohio. On Petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

529

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the

Monday, October 20th, 1919. (continued.)

be, and the same is hereby denied.
(See Mr. Chief Justice White.

Clay Arthur Pierce, Henry Clay Pierce, Pierce Investment Company,
Petitioners,
538 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.
(See Mr. Chief Justice White.

The New York, Chicago & St. Louis Railroad Company,
Petitioner
539 vs.
Clinton H. Pugh.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals, Eighth Judicial District, State of Ohio.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals, Eighth Judicial District, State of Ohio, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

The City of New York,
Petitioner

5/12 vs.

Consolidated Gas Company of New York, Charles
H. Newton, as Attorney
General, etc, et als, etc.

On Pe
writ of
to the
States
Court
Seale
Second

On consideration of the Petition
a writ of certiorari herein to the
States Circuit Court of Appeals
Second Circuit and of the argu
of counsel thereupon) had, as to
support of as against the said
is now here ordered by this Court
the said Petition be, and the sa
hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice

Pittsburgh, Cincinnati,
Chicago & St Louis Rail-
way Company,
Petitioner

5/15 vs.

Ellsworth G. Cole.

Sixth Circuit.

On Pet
for a
of certi
to the
States
Court of
Seale fo

On consideration of the Petitio
a writ of certiorari herein to the
States Circuit Court of Appeals

Sixth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

546 Benjamin Friedman, Petitioner vs. The United States of America. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

550 Raymond A. Kelly, Administrator of the Estate of Maurice Kelly, deceased, Petitioner vs. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota

Monday, October 20th 1919, continued.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

559

Columbus Packing Company, Petitioner
vs.
The State of Ohio on the relation of Hugo N. Schlesinger, Prosecuting Attorney of Franklin County, Ohio, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, October 20th 1919, (continued.)

422. M. Hampton Dodd, and Walter Wood Receivers of R. H. Wood & Company, Petitioners vs. Hewlings Lippincott and Alfred J. Major, Receivers of Camden Iron Works.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

For Mr. Chief Justice White.

483. American Waterbuilding Company, Petitioners vs. Hayes Wheel Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

Monday, October 20th, 1919, continued.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and of the argument of counsel therein for had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

514 Howard W. Showalter, Petitioner vs. The United States of America

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and of the argument of counsel therein for had, ~~as well~~ in support of ~~as against~~ the same, it is now here ordered by this Court, that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Chauncey J. Hamlin and Charles B. Wheeler, as surviving executors

Monday, October 20th 1919, continued

of the estate of Mary E. Daniels, deceased et al.,
Petitioners
vs.
519. Mary K. Wellington, individually and as Executrix of the Estate of Grace A. Wellington deceased et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari herein to the Surrogate's Court, Erie County, State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Surrogate's Court, Erie County, State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well on the part of and as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court, that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

George N. Belevin,
Petitioner
vs.
533 The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and of

had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

556 Seaboard Air Line Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Baltimore Trust Company, et al. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari hereon to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

565 White Oak Fuel Company, Petitioner vs. Bertram W. Carter et al., co-partners doing business as Carter Brothers

Monday, October 20th 1919, continued.

Coal and Ice Com- pany.
vs.
State Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now hereby ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Chief Justice announced that the Court will take a recess from Monday the 27th instant to Monday, November 10th.

106 The Atherton Mills, Appellant,
vs.
Eugene S. Johnston et al.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General King leave is granted to file brief as amicus curiae

and to take part in the oral argument of this cause on behalf of the United

Monday, October 20th 1919, continued

541 The United States of America et al., Appellants, vs. Alaska Steamship Company et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the appellants.

561 Oregon-Washington Railroad & Navigation Company, Petitioner vs. Grace H. Miller, as Administratrix, &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Carl A. Mapes in behalf of Mr. Arthur C. Spencer for the petitioner.

474 The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The American Brewing Company.

The motion to advance this cause to be heard with No. 458, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William L. Rawls, in behalf of Mr. Elihu Root, Mr. William D. Guthrie, and Mr. William L. Marbury

Monday, October 20th, 1919, continued.

for the defendants in error.

460 Rainier Brewing Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Great Northern Pacific Steamship Company.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Wm. Alexander Britton in behalf of Mr. Charles H. Carey, Mr. James B. Kerr and Charles A. Clark, for the defendants in error in support of the motion and by Mr. S. J. Wetteck for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

328 Kansas City, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Public Service Commission of Missouri et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm or advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James D. Lindsay, Mr. Frank Hagerman and Mr. Richard J. Higgins for the defendants in error in support of the motion and by Mr. Matthew A. Dyke for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

	W. L. Beuca, as Administrator, etc., et al. (Petitioners vs. William Robins)	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. M. Salinger
530	for the Petitioners.	
	The Kansas City Southern Railway Company (Petitioner vs. Robert M. Smith.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel M.
557	Moore and Mr. Cyrus Crane for the Petitioner and by Mr. Alfred W. Gosseth for the respondent.	
	Luella Swartwood, as sole administratrix, &c., (Plaintiff in Error, vs. Lehigh Valley Railroad Company.	This cause was continued on Stipulation of counsel and on motion of Mr. Frederick Tyler in behalf of counsel
49		

Monday, October 20th 1919. (continued.)

318 Mark Eisner, as collector, &c., (Plaintiff in Error,) vs. Myrtle N. Macomber.

This cause was reargued by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the (Plaintiff in error and by Mr. William L. Pierson for the Plaintiff in error and by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the defendant in error.)

264 Joseph V. Stilson, (Plaintiff in Error,) vs. The United States of America;

265 and Joseph Sukys, (Plaintiff in Error,) vs. The United States of America.

The argument in these cases was commenced by Mr. Henry John Nelson for the Plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, October 21st 1919.—

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Melvin T. Clausen it is ordered that Harvey S. Bowman, Esquire, of Santa Fe, State of New Mexico, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl E. Mapes, it is ordered that John Alfred Drummond Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan,

Tuesday, October 21st 1919, continued

be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wesley L. Jones, it is ordered that Edgar C. Snyder, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

The Yazoo & Mississippi Valley Railroad Company, et al.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The City of Clarksdale.
402

The motion to dismiss the writ of error and petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler on behalf of Mr. Gerald Fitz-Gerald, [illegible] for the defendant in error in support of the motion and by Mr. A. D. Minor, Mr. Charles N. Burch and Mr. Blewett Lee for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

A. L. Beachk,
Petitioner,
vs.
95

Tuesday, October 21st 1919, continued:

Wisconsin Pass Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. N. Watson, for the petitioner.

264 Joseph V. Stilson
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of America;

265 Joseph Sukye,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Henry John Nelson for the plaintiff in error, by Mr. Robert P. Stewart for defendant in error and concluded by Mr. Henry John Nelson for the plaintiff in error.

270 Peter Schaefer,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of America;

Peter Vogel,
Plaintiff in Error,
271 vs.
The United States

Tuesday, October 21st 1919, continued

of America),

272 Louis Werner, (Plaintiff in Error,) vs. The United States of America;)

273 Martin Markow, (Plaintiff in Error,) vs. The United States of America;

274 Herman Lemke, (Plaintiff in Error,) vs. The United States of America.

These cases were argued by Mr. Henry John Mulcon and Mr. William Gray for the Plaintiffs in error and by Mr. Robert P. Stewart for the defendant in error.

316 Jacob Abrams et al., (Plaintiffs in Error) vs. The United States of America.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Harry Weinberger for the Plaintiffs in error and continued by Mr. Robert P. Stewart for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, this Court is ad-

Wednesday, October 22d 1919 —

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met to-day at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert P. Stewart it is ordered that Arthur E. P. Chapman, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John F. Miller, it is ordered that J. Henry Denning, Esquire,

Wednesday, October 22d 1919, continued.

and Oliver B. Morgenson, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter D. Burns, it is ordered that Leroy C. Shontz, Esquire, Ernest A. Henderoth, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and Howard W. Hodgkins, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Pope Caldwell, it is ordered that William N. Hancock, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and this was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Beverley R. Dowell, it is ordered that J. Smith Mays, Esquire, of Winchester, and Harry Brent Mackoy, Esquire, of Covington, State of Kentucky,

Wednesday, October 22d 1919, continued

and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lawrence Y. Sherman, it is ordered that Arthur A. Ruebsch, Esquire of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. D. N. Caraway, it is ordered that John N. Dillman, Esquire, of Wynnewood, State of Arkansas, and C. Kenny Templeton Esquire, of Pawhuska, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

316 Jacob Abrams et al, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The United States of America.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Robert P. Stewart for the defendant in error and concluded by Mr. Harry Weinberger for the plaintiffs in error.

Wednesday, October 22d 1919, continued.

276 Robert P. Stroud,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was argued by Mr. Martin J. O'Donnell for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Robert C. Stewart for the defendant in error.

229 Louisiana Navigation Company, Limited,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Oyster Commission of Louisiana, &c.

This cause was argued by Mr. Edward N. Pugh for the plaintiff in error and submitted by Mr. L. E. Hall, for the defendants in error.

374 The New York Central Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Michael Bianc,

375 American Knife Company et al.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
George Sweeting;

Clark Knitting Company, Inc., et al, (Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Elizabeth Vaughn.

376

The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr. Robert E. Whalen for the Plaintiffs in error in No. 374, continued by Mr. William N. Foster for the Plaintiffs in error in Nos. 375 and 376, and by Mr. E. C. Aiken for the State Industrial Commission of New York.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Thursday, October 23d 1919 — —

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court was opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George P. Snyder, it is ordered that William M. Rinkle, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tracy L. Jeffords

(Thursday, October 23d 1919, continued)

M. Peters, Esquire, of St Albans, State of Vermont, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel Herrick, it is ordered that R. L. Mitchell, Esquire of Great Falls, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. John A. Miller, it is ordered that Pierce Lonergan, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

57

Julius Kilburn, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Oregon. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon, and this Plaintiff

Thursday, October 23d 1919, continued.

having been three times solemnly called by the Marshal to come into Court and prosecute his writ of error and failing to appear it is, Thereupon, in pursuance of the 16th. Rule of this Court, and on the motion of Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, in behalf of counsel for the defendant in error now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

371 The New York Central Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Michael Brand;

375 American Knife Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. George Sweating; and Black Knitting Com-

(Thursday, October 23d 99, continued.)

376 (Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Elizabeth Vaughn.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. E. C. Aiken for State Industrial Commission of New York and concluded by Mr. Robert E. Whalen for the in error in No. 374.

Abram C. Himes et al, Trustees, etc., et al., (Plaintiffs in Error,
44 vs.
The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania,

This cause was argued by Mr. Edmund Bayly Seymour for the Plaintiff in error and by Mr. Wm. M. Hargest for the defendant in error.

Kentucky Heating Company, et al., (Plaintiffs in Error,
46 vs.
The City of Louisville.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Matt O'Doherty for the Plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

The City of Los Angeles et al., (Plaintiffs in Error.
50 vs.
Los Angeles Gas & Electric

Thursday, October 23d 1919, continued.

Corporation.) This cause was argued by Mr. W. B. Mathews for the appellants and by Mr. Paul Overton for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Friday, October 24th, 1919

Pursuant to adjournment this Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph R. McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William R. Green, it is ordered that Cassius C. Dowell, Esquire, of Des Moines, and L. G. Haugen, Esquire, of Northwood, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank B. Kellogg, it is ordered that Dow S. McFarl

quire) and John S. Levin, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. C. Carlin, it is ordered that William B. Gourley, Esquire, of Paterson, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Levi H. David it is ordered that William Hollander, Esquire, of Oakland, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wesley L. Jones, it is ordered that Louis H. Pratt, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

(Friday, October 24th, 1919, continued.)

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Harold Hitchcock, it is ordered that Lincoln Bryant, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Arthur Crane,
Petitioner
vs.
The United States.

The motions for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur Crane pro se.

Edward B Preyor et al., as receivers, etc.,
Petitioners
58
vs.
Allegar Williams.

This cause was passed temporarily, per stipulation of counsel.

Seaboard Air Line Railway Co. et al.,
Appellants,
60
vs.
The United States of America et al.

This cause was passed temporarily per stipulation of counsel.

(Friday, October 24th 1919, continued.)

City of Winchester et al,
Appellants,
vs.
Winchester Waters Works Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. J. Smith Hays for the appellants, and by Mr. Beverley R. Jowett for the appellees.

51

Charles S. Ashley,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
William Cushing Wait et als.

This cause was argued by Mr. Charles R. Cummings for the plaintiff in error and Mr. Hitchcock for

by Mr. William Harold the defendant in error.

52

The Pennsylvania Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The Public Service Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

This cause was argued by Mr. Frederic W. McKenney for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. William N. Trenkle

53

for the defendant in error.

Christopher L. Williams, as receiver, etc., et al.,

Friday, October 24th 1919, continued.

54

vs

William H. Sattler.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of this Court by Mr. Stuart G. Gibboney for the appellants and by Mr. Lindley M. Garrison for the appellee.

Proclamation being made, the court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Monday, October 27th, 1919.—

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney,
Louis D. Brandeis
(Associate Justices)
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. F. Colladay, it is ordered that Julian M. Knight, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin Yates Webb, it is ordered that Edward N. Pou, Esquire of Smithfield, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney

was sworn according ly.

On motion first made to this Court on this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General King it is ordered that William Wolff Smith Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn according ly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Louis Quarles it is ordered that Ernest Leslie Bisbee, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of New York be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn according ly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. John S. Miller it is ordered that James G. Condon, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn according ly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, it is ordered that George Warner Swain, Esquire of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Monday, October 27th 1919, continued.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George E. Sullivan, it is ordered that Pleasant Bryan Mourhouse, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paul E. Lesh, it is ordered that Harry G. Fisher, Esquire, of Keyser, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court; and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry R. Gowers, it is ordered that Harold LeGrand Beyer, Esquire, of Grinnell, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clement L. Bouvé it is ordered that Walter D. Van Dame, Esquire, of Ancon, Canal Zone, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he

Monday, October 27th 1919, continued

Lawrence Maxwell, Jr.
Fidelity Trust Company
of New York, Executors of
the Last Will and Testa-
ment of James McDonald,
deceased,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Newton A.K. Bugbee, Comp-
troller of the Treasury
of the State of New Jersey,
and William N. Reed
State Treasurer.

In error to the
Court of
Errors and Ap-
peals of the
State of New
Jersey.

43

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from this Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Errors and Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Holmes.
Mr. Chief Justice White.
Mr. Justice Van Devanter.
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Monday, October 27th, 1919, continued

Louis H. Hill, Administrator of the Estate of James J. Hill, deceased,
(Plaintiff in Error,
238 vs.
Newton A. K. Bugbee, Comptroller of the Treasury, of the State of New Jersey and William T. Read, State Treasurer.

In error to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Errors and Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Holmes
Mr. Chief Justice White
Mr. Justice VanDevanter
Mr. Justice McReynolds

Monday, October 27th 1919, continued.

30

Central of Georgia Railway Company,
(Plaintiff in Error,)
vs.
William A. Wright,
Comptroller General,
etc.

(In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel. Pursuant to the order of this Court entered herein on April 21st 1919.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the judgment heretofore entered in this cause on February 3d 1919, do stand as the judgment of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna,
Mr. Justice Pitney,
Mr. Justice Brandeis.
Mr. Justice Clarke.

No. —

L. P. Bryant et al,
(Petitioners)
vs.
The United States.

On consideration of this motion to direct the Clerk of the United States

Monday, October 27th, 1919, continued.

Appeals for the Fifth Circuit to certify and forward the original transcript of record in this cause, and that the Clerk of this Court be directed to file the petition for a writ of certiorari herein.

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.)

No — Arthur Crane, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On consideration of the motion to direct the Clerk of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit to certify and forward the original transcript of record in this cause, and of the motion for leave to prosecute the cause in forma pauperis,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, denied.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.)

406 The Thurston Mills, Appellant, vs. Eugene A. Johnston — On consideration of the motion of counsel for the United States for

printed brief herein and to make oral argument;

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

541 The United States of America, &c., Interstate Commerce Commission, Appellants, vs. Alaska Steamship Company, Central of Georgia Railway Company, Clyde Steamship Company, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the case assigned for argument on Monday, December 8th next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

47 L The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The American Brewing Company.

On consideration of this motion to advance this cause for argument with case No. 458,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the

Monday, October 27th, 1919, continued.

hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

402 The Yazoo & Mississippi Valley Railroad Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The City of Clarksdale. It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motions to dismiss the writ of error and to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, be, and the same is hereby postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

395 A. L. Brachk, Petitioner, vs. San Antonio & Aransas Pass Railway Company. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Kansas City Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Kansas City Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be and

Monday, October 27th 1919. continued.

Per Mr Chief Justice White.

487 The Cudahy Packing Company, Petitioner vs. Edward B. Pryor Receiver of the Wabash Railroad Company. On Petition for writ of certiorari to the Kansas City Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of this Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Kansas City Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

451 David L. Aman and Henry B. Martin, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The United States of America. On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein It is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby, denied. Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, October 27th 1919, continued.

The United States of America on the relations of Simon Heiner, Plaintiff in Error and Appellant,

vs.

Nathan Gordon et al, members of Local Board for Division 157 of the City of New York and the District Board of New York.

In error to and Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

247.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King, in behalf of counsel for the Plaintiff in error and Appellant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause and this Appeal,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, and this Appeal be, and the same are hereby dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

N.E. Kirchner,
Petitioner

vs

99.

Monday, October 27th, 1919, (continued)

of America). On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King in behalf of counsel for the petitioner and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

567

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. A. Schrader's Sons, (Inc).

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the plaintiff in error.

C. C. Ashton, Attorney General of the State of New Mexico et al., Defendants.

Monday, October 27th 1919, continued

621 The Continental Oil Company; vs. O. O. Askren, Attorney General of the State of New Mexico, et al., Appellants;

622 Sinclair Refining Company; vs. O. O. Askren, Attorney General of the State of New Mexico, et al., Appellants;

623 The Texas Company; vs. National Brake and Electric Company, Petitioner vs Neils A. Christensen et al.

The motions to advance these causes were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. D. Mulamy in behalf of counsel for the appellant.

The motion for writ of Prohibition or other proper remedy was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John S. Miller, Mr. Thomas B. Kerr, Mr. Charles A. Brown and Mr. Edward Osgood Brown for the petitioner in support of the petition and by Mr. Joel

Monday, October 27th, 1919, continued

William R. Rummler, and Louis Quarles for the respondents in opposition thereto.

Philadelphia and Reading Railway Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Margaret L. Hancock.

415

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hannis Taylor for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. George Gowen Parry, for the plaintiff, in error in opposition thereto.

The Baldwin Company, and The Valley Gem Piano Company,
Appellants,
vs.
R.S. Howard Company, and
The Baldwin Company,
Petitioner
vs.
R.S. Howard Company,

446

387

Mr. Samuel S. Watson for the respondent.

The motions in these causes as to printing the record was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Laurence Maxwell and Mr. John E. Gross for the appellants and petitioner and by the appellee and

Monday, October 27th 1919, continued.

560 Peter Weisengoff, Petitioner, vs. George R. Harris, Administrator, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank Gosnell on behalf of Mr. William L. Marbury, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Albert A. Doub and Mr. Harry G. Fisher for the respondent.

Orig. The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, vs. The State of Texas.

The motion for leave to file a bill of complaint herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. P. Freeling for the complainant.

45 Thomas S. Raymond, Appellant, vs. Anthony Bowers, J. Walter Barnes, Albert L. Lehman, and Chas L. Smith.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of West Virginia.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss this appeal has been filed

motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Jung Back Sing and Klear Shee, Petitioners,
vs.
532 Edward White, as Commissioner of Immigration, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jackson H. Ralston for the petitioners and by Mr. Solicitor General King for the respondent.

The Standard Fashion Company, Petitioner
vs.
552 Magrane-Houston Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert G. Dodge, Mr. C. E. Hughes, Mr. Herbert Noble and Mr. James B. Sheehan for the petitioner.

G. E. Hosier, Petitioner

Monday, October 27th, 99, continued

The United States of America. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry Bowdin and Mr. W. Willey for the petitioner and by Mr. Robert P. Stewart and Mr. Nanny S. Ridgely for the respondent.

576 Walter Naymacher, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis A. Croxton for the petitioner and by Mr. Robert P. Stewart and Mr. Nanny S. Ridgely for the respondent.

496 Hartford Life Insurance Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Cecilia Blinco Administratrix &c. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick H. Lehmann, Mr. James C. Jones and Mr. George P. Waid for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until

Monday, November 10th, 1919

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna.
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Burton L. French it is ordered that Fred H. Grant, Esquire, of Coeur d'Alene, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Royal P. McKenna it is ordered that Charles A. Walls, Es-

Monday, November 10th 1919, continued.

be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. Harvey M. Grund, it is ordered that Ralph E. Robertson, Esquire, of Juneau, Territory of Alaska be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this cause, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Maurice H. Rosenberg, it is ordered that Lawrence J. Keller, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. C. B. Parkhill, it is ordered that Hugh C. Smith, Esquire, and George B. Whitsett, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

Monday, November 10th 1919, continued.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General King, it is ordered that Dougal Herr, Esquire, of Hoboken, State of New Jersey, and Daniel N. Hoffman, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles A. Needham it is ordered that Elmer Westlake, Esquire of San Francisco, State of California, and Lewis A. Bell, Esquire of Chicago, State of Chicago, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William N. Delaney it is ordered that Ray McCall Delaney of Norfolk, State of Virginia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. O. Bell it is

Monday, November 10th 1919. continued.

and Francis Stewart Esquire, of Muskogee, State of Oklahoma be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Cobb, it is ordered that Fleming H. Dickie, Esquire, of Savannah, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Jacob Abrams et al., (Plaintiffs in Error,) vs. The United States. } In error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

316

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause

Monday, November 10th, 1919, continued.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Holmes.
Mr. Justice Brandeis.

254. Alex. J. Groesbeck et al., Appellants, vs. Duluth South Shore & Atlantic Railway Company. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

9 The Bank of Oxford and Edward Mayer and Robert B. Mayer, Plaintiffs in Error,

Monday, November 10th 1919, continued.

J. S. Love, E. T. Anderson, and S. S. Harris, Bank Examiners of the State of Mississippi.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

J. S. Mullen, L. N. Mullen, W. M. Bonner and Will Trout,

Plaintiffs in Error,

25

vs.

Malinda Pickens, Francis Bell and T. E. Glover.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the

homa and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

L. V. Mullen and J. S. Mullen, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Anderson Gardner and Phelin Garder. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

26

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the state of Oklahoma and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

The New York Central

Monday, November 10th, 1919, continued.

374 Plaintiff's in Error, vs. Michael Bianc. In error to the Supreme Court, (Appellate Division, Third Judicial Department of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court, Appellate Division, Third Judicial Department of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney, dissenting.

Mr. Justice McReynolds.

375 American Knife Company and Aetna Life Insurance Company, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. George Sweiting. In error to the Supreme Court, Appellate Division, Third Judicial Department of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard

Monday, November 10th, 1919, continued

the Supreme Court, Appellate Division, Third Judicial Department of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney, dissenting; Mr. Justice McReynolds.

376

Clark Knitting Company, Inc., and Aetna Life Insurance Company, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Elizabeth Vaughn. In error to the Supreme Court, Appellate Division, Third Judicial Department of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court, Appellate Division, Third Judicial Department of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme

Monday, 3 November 10th 1919, continued.

is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney,

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Railway Company,

Plaintiffs in Error,

vs.

Alvin J. Dirk.

In error to the Court of Appeals of Montgomery County, State of Ohio.

2

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of Montgomery County, State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals of Ohio be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said Court of Appeals for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinions of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

Jacob Stilson,

Plaintiff in Error,

Monday, November 10th, 1919, continued.

The United States of America. — In error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Holmes.
Mr. Justice Brandeis.

265 Joseph Sukys, Plaintiff in Error, — In error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.
vs.
The United States of America. —

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

Monday, November 10th 1919, (continued.)

now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Clark.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Holmes
Mr. Justice Brandeis.

53

The Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The Public Service Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and Order of Railway Conductors and Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

In error to the Superior Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Superior Court of the State of Pennsylvania and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Superior Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that

remanded to the said Superior Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Clarke.

311

Stephen N. F. Pell,
Charles A. Kittle,
Howard N. Pell and
Robert McThompson,
Petitioners,
vs.
N. Gordon McCabe,
Jr., and William A. Gray.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice

Monday, November 10th, 1919, continued.

335 Stephen N. I. Bell,
Charles A. Kittle,
Howland H. Bell,
and Robert M. Thompson,
Appellants,
vs.
H. London McCabe,
Jr., and William H. Gray.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the Transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

36 The United States of America on the relation of Alaska Smokeless Coal Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Franklin K. Lane, as

and Clay Tallman, as Commissioner of the General Land Office. } In error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

38 Lehigh Coal & Navigation Company, } vs. The United States. } On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the first question certified must be answered in the affirmative.

Monday, November 10th 1919, continued.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

122 Ricardo Cartas, Appellant, vs. The United States. This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and on motion to dismiss or affirm, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

90 City of Chicago, Chicago City Railway Company, Chicago Railways Company, et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Thomas E. Dempsey, as Chairman and Chairman of Dunk, et al., Individually and as mem-

Utilities Commission et al. vs. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

52

Charles S. Ashley, Plaintiff in Error, vs. William Cushing Wait, Lorannus E. Hitchcock, William H. Dana, Henry C. Attwill, Attorney General and Edward R. Hathaway. In error to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered adjudged by this

Monday, November 10th 1919, continued.

writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby dismissed without costs for want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

328 Kansas City, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Public Service Commission of Missouri and the Kansas City Railways Company. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

460 Rainier Brewing Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Great Northern Pacific

Monday, November 10th, 1919, continued.)

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Hiram C. Kimes et al, Trustees for Bondholders of New Philadelphia Graphite Company et al, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

44

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be

Monday, November 10th, 1919, continued.

The same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Kentucky Heating Company and The Louisville Gas and Electric Company, Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The City of Louisville.

In error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Christopher L. Williams, as Receiver of the First National Bank of Bayonne, New Jersey, and the First National Bank of Bayonne, New Jersey,

Appellants.

Monday, November 10th, 99, continued.)

54 vs. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.
William H. Salter.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

229 Louisiana Navigation Company, Limited, (Plaintiff in Error) vs. Oyster Commission of Louisiana (now Department of Conservation of Louisiana) et al. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now

Monday, November 10th 1919, continued

that the writ of error, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

City of Birmingham, Plaintiff in Error, vs. D. J. O'Connell. — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama.

5

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court the writ of error, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed without costs for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Mineral Separations, Limited, et al. Petitioners vs. Butte & Superior Mining Company et al — On consideration of the motion to recall the mandate and disallow costs in this cause, It is now here ordered

599

by the Court that the said motion be

Monday, November 10th, 1913, continued

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant vs. The State of Texas. — Orig'l

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a bill of complaint herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and that said process be issued returnable on Monday, March 1st next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

387 The Baldwin Company, Petitioner vs. R. S. Howard Company, and The Baldwin Company and Valley Town Piano Company, Appellants, vs. R. S. Howard Company. 446

On considerations of the motion to receive the petitioner and appellants from printing the entire record in these cases, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted on an understanding that they will furnish for the use of the Court and counsel at the hearing printed copies of the record as filed in the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia [illegible]

Monday, November 10th, 1919, continued.)

certified by the Clerk of that Court.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

National Bank &
Electric Company,
Petitioner,
382 vs.
Neils A. Christensen
et al.

On consideration of the motions for a writ of Prohibition herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

O. O. Askren, Attorney General of the State of New Mexico, et al.,
Appellants,
521 vs.
The Continental Oil Company;

O. O. Askren, Attorney General of the State of New Mexico, et al.,
Appellants;
522 vs.
Sinclair Refining Company,

General of the State of New Mexico, et al., Appellants,
523 vs.
The Texas Company.

On consideration of the motions to advance these cases, It is now here ordered by this Court that said motions be, and the same are hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, January 5th next.
Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error,
567 vs.
A. Schrader's Son, Inc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January, 5th next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.
Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Hartford Life Insurance Company, Plaintiff in Error,
496 vs.
Cecelia Blinco, Administratrix of the Estate of Rosa Barbee, deceased.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a

Monday, November 10th 1919, continued:

ceari herein, be, and the same is postponed until the hearing of the case on the writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Philadelphia & Reading Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Margaret L. Hancock. /15

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the transcript of record filed on the writ of error to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Philadelphia & Reading Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Margaret L. Hancock. /15

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Standard Pavilions

552 Petitioner, vs. Maguane-Houston Company, for the First Circuit.) On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Chief Justice White.

532 Jung Back Sing and Clear Shee, Petitioners vs. Edward White, Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of San Francisco. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as

Monday, November 10th, 1919, continued:

it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

558 G. E. Nozier, Petitioner vs. The United States of America. On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

560 Peter Weissenhoff, Petitioner vs. George R. Harris, Administrator of the Estate of Donald R. Harris, deceased. On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit

Monday, November 10th, 1919, continued

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

576 Walter Keynacher, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

121 Charles A. Hitchcock, Petitioner vs.

Monday, November 10th 1919. (continued.)

Alfred E. Scatter
good et al.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause be, and the same is hereby Postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.)

Strathearn Steamship Company, Limited,
(Petitioner)
vs.
John Dillon.

373

The motion for leave to file brief as amicus curiae and to take part in the oral argument in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the United States.

Roberto Gayon,
(Plaintiff in Error)
vs.
Thomas H. McCarthy, U.S. Marshal, etc.

540

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the defendant in error.

Elwood Hamilton,
Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

589 vs. Kentucky Distilleries & Warehouses Company.

The motion to advance and to set this case for hearing on the 20th instant was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the appellant.

237 The Globe Works, appellant, vs. The United States.

The motion to remand this cause to the Court of Claims for further findings of fact was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John S. Blair for the appellant in support of the motion and by Mr. Solicitor General King and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Davis for the appellee in opposition thereto.

593 Charles E. Smith, appellant, vs. Kansas City Title & Trust Company et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Williams Marshall Bullitt for the appellant.

Monday, November 10th, 1919, continued.

Northern Pacific Railway Company, Appellant,
vs.
109. The United States.

On motion of Mr. Bert E. Barlow and Mr. O. R. Severen, leave is hereby granted to file brief for the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railway Company as amicus curiae in this cause.

J. M. Thompson, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
286 R. B. Hay, Sheriff, and Tax Collector et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. N. Garland Dupré in behalf of Mr. Harry C. Snead for the defendants in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. William C. Marshall for the plaintiff in Error in opposition thereto.

Henry Peters et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
17 Thomas Veasey.

The death of Thomas Veasey, the defendant in error herein suggested, and the appearance of Nellie Veasey as administra-

Veasey, deceased, filed and entered, on motion of Mr. R. R. Shearer in behalf of counsel for this defendant in error.

581 Mary L. Greer Conklin, Appellant, vs. George H. Conklin et al. The motion for an order on judge of lower Court to file an opinion, and motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, in behalf of the appellant.

511 Guiseppe Cavallero, Petitioner, vs. Steamship "Carlo Poma" etc. Kingdom of Italy, claimant. The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George H. Lamar in behalf of counsel.

386 Brooks Scanlon Com'p'any, Petitioner vs. Railroad Commis-

Monday, November 10th 1879, continued.

sions of Louisiana). The motions to advance this cause was submitted to the Court by Mr. S. R. Prince in behalf of counsel.

Joslin Manufacturing Company,
(Plaintiff in Error,)
183 vs.
The City of Providence et al.;

Situate Light and Power Company,
(Plaintiff in Error,)
184 vs.
The City of Providence et al.;
and
Theresa B. Joslin,
(Plaintiff in Error,)
185 vs.
The City of Providence et al.

The motions to dismiss in these cases were submitted to the consideration of this Court by Mr. Albert A. Baker, and Mr. Elmer S. Chace for the defendants in error in each of said

W. McCartin, Mr. Francis J. McCanna and Mr. Alfred G. Chaffee for the Plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

The Petitions for writs of certiorari herein were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Francis J. McCanna, Robert W. McCartin, Mr. J. Jerome Hahn and Mr. Alfred G. Chaffee for the Plaintiffs in error in support of the Petitions.

182 William J. Geary, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Alice Geary. — The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. E. Evans for the defendant in error in support of the motion and by Mr. D. M. Zink for the Plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

382 National Brake and Electric Company, Petitioner vs. Neils A. Christensen et al. — The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of this Court by Mr. Joseph B. Cotton, Mr. Willet M. Spooner Mr. William R. Rumsey and Mr.

Monday, November 10th 1919, continued.

Louis Quarles for the respondents in support of the motion, and by Mr. Thomas B. Keen, Mr. Charles A. Brown, Mr. John S. Miller and Mr. Edward Osgood Brown for the petitioner in opposition thereto.

Rudolph Ernest Diedemann, (Plaintiff in Error,) vs. Gertrude Eleanor Diedemann) 438

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Elijah N. Zoline and Mr. Louis J. Vorhaus for the defendant in error in support of the motion and by Mr. Thomas S. Cummings and Mr. Nash Rockwood for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, (Plaintiff in Error,) vs. G. M. Bollis 544

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Julian C. Wilson and Mr. Hattie C. Armstrong for the defendant in error in support of the motion and by Mr. J. M. Canada and Mr. Edward J. Mathis for the plaintiff in error in

Monday, November 10th, 1919, continued.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Mr. J. M. Canada and Mr. Edward J. White for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition and by Mr. Julian C. Wilson and Mr. Walter Carmathing for the defendant in error in opposition thereto.

Birmingham Trust & Savings Company, as Trustee, etc.,
Petitioner,
vs.
410 The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John P. Dillman for the petitioner and by Mr Assistant Attorney General Brown for the respondent.

Michael Pomasco,
Petitioner,
vs.
427 Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad Company,

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George Clinton for the petitioner and by Mr Maurice C. Pratt for the respondent.

Monday, November 10th 1919, continued).

466 Armour & Company, et al., Petitioners vs. Texas & Pacific Railway Company et al. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the 4th Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. M. McCormick and Mr. Francis Marion Etheridge for the petitioners and by Mr. Thomas J. Freeman for the respondents.

568 Union Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner vs. J. E. Burke. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Oscar R. Houston and Mr. H. Roger Englar for the petitioner and by Mr. Arthur M. Clement and Mr. Wilson E. Dodge for the respondent.

572 Avery & Son, Inc., Petitioner vs. Welch Grape Juice Company. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr.

Monday, November 10th, 1919, continued.

The Barber Asphalt Paving Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
217 William N. Hoeckheide et al.:

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Franklin Shaw et al.,
Appellants,
vs.
65 Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior et al.

This cause was passed pursuant to the 26th rule on motion of Mr Solicitor General King for the appellee.

South Coast Steamship Company,
Petitioner,
68

Monday, November 10th 1919, continued:

J. C. Rudbach. This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clower (Dibble) for the petitioner and by Mr. S. Hasket Herbst for the respondent.

Ex Parte In the Matter of J. Raymond Riffaner, as Receiver &c. Petitioner. Orig'l. The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of Mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Dougal Kerr for the petitioner.

55 The Milwaukee Electric Railway & Light Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Wisconsin ex rel. City of Milwaukee. This cause was argued by Mr. Edward D. Mack for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Clifton Williams for the defendant in error.

59 Bert Rucker, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Marion A. Allord. This cause was submitted to the considera-tion of the

Monday, November 10th 1919, continued.

Mr. Joseph G. Waters and Mr. Joseph M. Stark for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Lee Monroe for the defendant in error.

William T. Wagner, et als., etc.
Plaintiff's in Error,
vs.
The City of Covington.
Defendant in error.

61.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Harry Brent Mackoy for the plaintiff's in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, November 11th 1919 ——

Pursuant to adjournment this Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna)
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter (Associate
Mahlon Pitney (Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr Robert N. Elder, it is ordered that John F. O'Brien, Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Selden P. Spencer it is ordered that Harry E. Kemp, Esquire

mitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. Lindley M. Nadler, it is ordered that Leander D. Duncan, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry P. Blair, it is ordered that Charles A. Post, Esquire of Los Angeles, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

589

Elwood Hamilton, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Collection District of Kentucky, Appellant,

vs.

Kentucky Distilleries & Warehouse Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by this Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for

Tuesday, November 11th 1919, continued.

at the head of the list that day,
Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

354. National Council Junior Order United American Mechanics, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Catherine A. Nicodemus

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Fred Nerrington for the defendant in error in support of the motion and by Mr. George P. Steele for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

419. Frank Shaffer, Petitioner vs. The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David A. Baer and Mr. John J. Sullivan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert P. Stewart and Mr. Harvey S. Ridgeley for the respondent.

Robert G. Ewrien, Commissioner of Public Lands of

(Tuesday, November 11th 1919, continued)

Mexico,
Appellant,
vs.
The United States
of America.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. B. Renshaw for the appellant and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Nebeker and Mr. Leslie C. Garnett for the appellee.

72

William P. Wagner et al., etc.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The City of Corning.

This argument of this cause was continued by Mr. A. E. Stricklett for the defendant in error and concluded by Mr. Hamm, Brent Mackey for the plaintiffs in error.

61

Frank A. Bones,
Petitioner,
vs.
Commissioner of
Marion County,
Respondent.

This cause was argued by Mr. Clarence E. Mehlhop for the petitioner, and by Mr. V. N. Lockwood for the

63.

Great Northern Railway Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.

64

Tuesday, November 11th 1919, continued.

The State of Washington. It is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed temporarily.

St Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Dickey Williams & Lucy Williams. This cause was argued by Mr. Robert E. Riley for the plaintiff in error. No appearance for the defendant in error.

66

Thomas J. Evans, Sole Surviving Receiver, &c., Petitioner vs. National Bank of Savannah. This argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Frederick D. Sawsey for the Petitioner.

67

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Wednesday, November 12th 1919

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fritz G. Lanham, it is ordered that Robert M. Rowland, Esquire, of Fort Worth, State of Texas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Oscar W. Underwood, it is ordered that William Shelton Pritchard, Esquire, of Burnsville, State of

Wednesday, November 12th 1919, continued:

of Alabama be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

78 Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. George W. Bowles

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander Britton, Mr. J. W. Terry, and Mr. John T. Gregg, for the Plaintiff in error. No appearance for the defendant in error.

79 Frank P. McCloskey, Plaintiff in Error, vs. John W. Robin, Sheriff of Bexar County, Texas.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. N. Ward for the Plaintiff in error and by Mr. Luther Nickels and Mr. B. F. Looney, for the defendant in error.

Thomas J. Evans, sole Surviving receiver &c., Petitioner

Wednesday, November 12th 1919, continued.

National Bank of Savannah).

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Frederick P. Saussy for the petitioner, by Mr. Edward S. Elliott for the respondent and concluded by Mr. Frederick P. Saussy for the petitioner.

Edward E. O'Brien et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
69 vs.
The Public Service Commissions of the First District of the State of New York, etc.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Robert H. Elder for the plaintiffs in error. The Court declined to hear further argument in this cause.

William D. Hays,
Appellant,
70 vs.
Port of Seattle, The State of Washington et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. William D. Hays in propria persona, and by Mr. L. D. Turner, for the appellee.

St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Company,
Appellant,
71. vs.

Wednesday, November 12th, 1919, continued.

The United States. This cause was argued by Mr. Benjamin Carter for the appellant and by Mr. William L. Pierson for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Thursday, November 13th, 1919

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
} Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clyde C. Dawson, it is ordered that Dyson Lewis, Jr., Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn according by.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. N. Garland Dupre, it is ordered that George Janvier, Esquire of New Orleans, State of Louisiana be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Thursday, November 13th 1919.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur Mellen it is ordered that George S. Hawke, Esquire of Cincinnati, State of Ohio be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. A. Elston, it is ordered that Hugo D. Newhouse, Esquire, and Warren A. Pillsbury, Esquire of San Francisco, State of California be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Western Union Telegraph Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Peter Boegli.

83

On motion of Mr. John A. Klotz, Jr. in behalf of counsel for the defendant in error,

it is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby passed pursuant to the 26th Rule.

Sue Erskine Newman
Administratrix &c., et
al.

Thursday, November 13th, 1919, continued.

85 vs. Ida M. Moyers et al. This cause was passed temporarily on motion of Mr. Charles D. Consaul for the appellees.

Carter Glass, Secretary of the Treasury, et al., Appellants, Leave granted to file brief as amicus curiae in this cause on motion of Mr. C. W. Mauzy in that behalf.

86 vs.

McDonald L. Ormes, Administrator, etc.

Maryland Casualty Company, Appellant, This cause was argued by Mr. Bush E. Barlow for the appellant and by Mr. William L. Frierson for the appellee.

73 vs.

The United States.

Margaret H. Sanger, Plaintiff in Error, This cause was argued by Mr. Jonah J. Goldstein for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Harry E. Anderson for the defendant in error.

75 vs.

The People of the State of New York.

Thursday, November 13th 1919, continued.

76

The Birge-Forbes Company
Petitioner
vs.
Carl R. Steyer.

The argument of this cause was commenced by by Mr. Henry C. Head for the Petitioner and continued by Mr. Robert M. Rowland for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Friday, November 14th 1919

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present.

The Honorable Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General King it is ordered that Heath S. Rowe, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ralph S. Rounds, it is ordered that Eugene Congleton, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

(Friday, November 17th 1919, continued.)

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry G. Snyder, it is ordered that John B. Rudkin, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. N. Letchworth, it is ordered that Paul H. Durant, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Rush Taggart, it is ordered that Martin E. Olson, Esquire, of Atlantic City, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mrs. Ellin Spencer Mussey, it is ordered that Miss Mary Poole, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court

(Friday, November 14th, 1919, continued.)

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. G. B. Rose, it is ordered that Earle D. Angell, Esquire, of White Sulphur Springs, State of Montana be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

87 The United States of America, Appellant, vs. The Keystone Watch Case Company, and The Keystone Watch Case Company.

It is ordered that this case be passed pursuant to the 26th Rule on motion of Mr. Solicitor General King for the United States of America.

86. Carter Glass, Secretary of the Treasury, et al., Appellants, vs. McDonald L. Ormes, Administrator, etc.

It is ordered that this case be passed pursuant to the 26th Rule on motion of Miss Mary C. Poole for the appellee.

76 Burge-Forbes Company, Petitioner vs. Carl R. Keyes.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Robert McCulloch

Friday, November 14th 1919, continued.

for the respondent and concluded by Mr. Henry O. Head for the petitioner.

77 Henry Peters et al, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Nellie Veasey, Administratrix &c.

This cause was argued by Mr. George Jamvier for the Plaintiffs in error and submitted by Mr. Walter S. Penfield for the defendant in error.

80 N. Turner et al, executors &c, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. J. P. Wade, Sheriff of Brooks County, Georgia.

This cause was argued by Arthur G. Powell for the Plaintiffs in error. No brief was filed for the defendant in error.

81 Liverpool, Brazil & River Plate Steam Navigation Company, Petitioner vs. Brooklyn Eastern Electric Terminal.

This cause was argued by Mr. Van Vechten Veeder for the petitioner and by Mr. Samuel Park, for the respondent.

(Friday, November 14th 1919, continued.)

(J. N. Brawson)
Sheriff and Collector, etc., et al
Appellants,
vs.
B. F. Bush, Receiver &c.

82

(This cause was argued by Mr. George B. Rose for the appellants and by Mr. Thomas B. Pryor for the appellees.

(Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday next at twelve o'clock)

Monday, November 17th 1919.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present.

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter (Associate
Mahlon Pitney (Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in their behalf by Mr. Solicitor General King, it is ordered that H. Cleveland Rumyon, Esquire; Emory R. Buckner, Esquire; Hatton S. Dreyfoos, Esquire and Max Lowenthal, Esquire of New York City, and David A. Richardson, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Monday, November 17th, 1919, continued:

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert P. Stewart, it is ordered that John P. Creighton, Esquire of Springfield, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn according ly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. S. Barker, it is ordered that Ellis B. Cooper, Esquire of Jackson, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Bynum E. Venton, it is ordered that Arthur C. Eckert, Esquire, of St Louis, State of Missouri be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

179. The United States of America, Appellant, vs. The Southern Pacific Company et al. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

Monday, November 17th 1919, continued.)

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed, and that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

William J. Geary, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Alice Geary. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

182

(This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and was argued by counsel. on motion to dismiss which

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this

Monday, November 17th, 1919, continued.

cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Joslin Manufacturing Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The City of Providence, Walter L. Clarke, as City Treasurer, et al. — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Rhode Island.

183

This cause came on to be heard on the Transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Rhode Island and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Joslin Manufacturing Company, Plaintiff in Error vs. The City of Providence, et al. — On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered

183

Monday, November 17th, 1919, continued:

That the said petitioner be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

187 Situate Light & Power Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The City of Providence, Walter L. Clarke, as City Treasurer, et al. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Rhode Island.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Rhode Island and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

187 Situate Light & Power Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The City of Providence et al. On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by the

said Petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

185 Theresa B. Joslin, Plaintiff in error, vs. The City of Providence, Walter L. Clarke, as City Treasurer, et al's. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Rhode Island.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Rhode Island and was argued by counsel on motion to dismiss which

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

185 Theresa B. Joslin, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The City of Providence, Walter L. Clarke, as City Treasurer, et al. On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said

Monday, November 17th 1919, continued)

and the same is hereby denied.
(Per Mr. Chief Justice White).

J. M. Thompson)
(Plaintiff in Error,)
vs.
R. B. Hays, Sheriff
and Tax Collector,
et al).

In error to the
Supreme Court
of the State of
Louisiana.

286

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.
(Per Mr. Chief Justice White)

National Council Junior
Order United American
Mechanics
(Plaintiff in Error,)
vs.
Catherine A. Nicodemus.

In error
to the Su-
preme
Court of
the State
of Colorado.

54

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the

and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof it is ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

438

Rudolph Ernest Riedemann,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Gertrude Eleanor Riedemann.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York and on motion to dismiss or affirm and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

59

Bert Rucker,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.

Monday, November 17th 1919, (continued)

Marion A. Patlow In error to the Su-
preme Court of
the State of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Edward E. O'Brien,
John J. O'Brien, and
Frank X. O'Brien
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The Public Service Commission of the First District of the State of New York, Acting on behalf of the City of New York.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

69

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York,

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

75

Margaret N. Sanger,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The People of the State of New York.

In error to the Court of Special Sessions of the City of New York for the County of Kings, State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the Transcript of the record from the Court of Special Sessions of the City of New York for the County of Kings, State of New York and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railway Company, and The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Com-

Monday, November 17th 1919, continued.

78 Jane Plaintiff in Error, vs. George N. Bowles. In error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Texas and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, That the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Orig'e Ex parte In the Matter of J. Raymond Tiffany, Receiver, etc. Petitioner. On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by the Court

is hereby granted, and a rule to show cause awarded returnable Monday, December 8th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex Parte In the Matter of E. Raymond Tiffany, Receiver, etc., Petitioner. — Orig'l

On consideration of the petition for a writ of mandamus herein.

It is now here ordered by the Court that cause be shown by Honorable J. Warren Davis, District Judge of the United States for the District of New Jersey and the said District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey, before this Court, at Washington, on Monday, December 8th 1919, at 12 o'clock noon of that day, or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard, why the prayer of said petition should not be granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

237

The Globe Works Appellant, vs. The United States

On consideration of the motion to remand this cause to the Court of Claims for further findings of fact.

It is now here

Monday, November 17, 1919, continued.

and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Strathearn Steamship Company, Ltd.
Petitioner
vs.
373 John Dillon.

On consideration of the motion on behalf of the United States for leave to file printed brief herein and to take part in the oral argument

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Mary L. Greer Conklin,
Appellant,
vs.
581 George N. Conklin, et al.

On considera-tion of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White,

Brooks-Scanlon Company,
Petitioners,
386

Monday, November 17th, 1913, continued

Railroad Commission of Louisiana. On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 5th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

540 Roberto Gayon
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Thomas H. McCarthy, United States Marshal for the Southern District of New York, et al. On considerations of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 5th next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

593 Charles E. Smith
Appellant,
vs.
Kansas City Title On consideration of the motion to advance this

Monday, November 17th, 1919, continued.) -

now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 5th next, after the cause heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

511 Giuseppe Cavallaro, Petitioner, vs. Steamship "Carlo Poma," her engines etc., Kingdom of Italy, Claimant. On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

382 National Brake & Electric Company, Petitioner, vs. Neils A. Christensen et al. It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

568

Union Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner
vs.
James J. E. Burke

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

410

Birmingham Trust & Saving Company as Trustee in Bankruptcy of The Standard Stone Company, Bankrupt, Petitioner
vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of

Monday, November 17th 1919, continued.

as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

427 Michael Tomasco, Petitioner vs. Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad Company. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

466 Armour & Company and Armour & Company, of Texas, Petitioners vs. Texas & Pacific Railway Company and Pearl Wight, as Receiver. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

572 Frey & Son, Incorporated, Petitioner vs. Welch Grape Juice Company. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Oregon-Washington Railroad & Navigation Company,

Monday, November 17th, 1919, continued.

561 vs. Grace D. Fuller, as Administratrix of the Estate of Walter Thomas Fuller, deceased. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White).

W. L. Bruce, as Administrator of the Estate of John P. Dolbin, deceased, and Catherine Dolbin, Petitioners — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Dakota.

630 vs. William Dolbin.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Dakota, and of the argument of counsel thereon had in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court

is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

"The Kansas City Southern Railway Company, Petitioner

557 vs.

Robert H. Smith.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Chief Justice announced that the Court will take a recess from Monday the 24th instant, to Monday, December 8th next.

North Brothers Company, Petitioners

525 vs.

Ephraim Lederer, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the respondent.

Forged Steel Wheel Company,

Monday, November 17th 1919, continued.

526 Petitioner vs. C. G. Lewellyn, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc. The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the respondent.

Carbon Steel Company, Petitioner 535 vs. C. G. Lewellyn, Collector of Internal Revenue &c. The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the respondent.

Jacob Ruppert, a corporation, Appellant, 603 vs. Frank K. Caffey, United States Attorney &c., On motion of Mr. Emory R. Buckner for the appellant, it is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, advanced and assigned for Thursday, the 20th instant, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Monday, November 17th 1919, continued)

602. Alphonse Dery Sons et al, Appellants, vs. William N. Edwards, Collector of Internal Revenue &c,

On motion of Mr. Walter S. Dery Sons, it is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, advanced, and assigned for argument on Thursday the 20th instant, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

348 Erie Railroad Company, Petitioner vs. William M. Collins.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler in behalf of Mr. Adelbert Moot for the Petitioner.

355 Erie Railroad Company, Petitioner vs. Antoni Szarp.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler in behalf of Mr. William C. Cannon for the Petitioner.

Monday, November 17th 1919, continued:

188 Georgia M. Houston, Administratrix, &c., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Seaboard Air Line Railway Company. The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. G. Hatton for the defendant in error in support of the motion.

563 Inter-Urban Railway Company et al., Petitioners, vs. Mrs. Dreda Smith. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William N. Conoway on behalf of Mr. Frank J. Hogan and Mr. James L. Parrish for the petitioners, and by Mr. R.M. Haines for the respondent.

290 The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Eva Roberts Cole as Administratrix, etc. The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr.

for the defendant in error in support of the motion and by Mr. R. J. Roberts for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Southern Pacific Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
334 Leo L. O'Neal, Jr.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur H. Clement and Mr. Wilson E. Riddle for the defendant in error in support of the motion and by Mr. Fred N. Wood for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Bascom C. Thompson,
Petitioner
vs.
598 The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. P. H. Cullen for the petitioner and by Mr. Robert P. Stewart and Mr. H. C. Herron for the respondent.

Harry Thornton Keathley,
Petitioner
vs.
92 United States [illegible]

Monday, November 17th 1919, continued.

Company et al., as Executors, &c.

This cause was passed to be restored to the call pursuant to section 9, Rule 26 on motion of Mr. N.B. Rowland in behalf of counsel.

Erie Railroad Company et al., Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
93 to 100 Board of Public Utility Commissioners, City of Paterson, et al.

These causes were passed to be restored to the call pursuant to section 9 of rule 26, on motion of Mr. Frederic H. McKenney, in behalf of counsel.

The Cuyahoga River Power Company, Appellant,
vs
102 The Northern Ohio Traction and Light Company et al.

It is ordered that this cause be passed pursuant to Rule 26 on motion of Mr. George A. King in behalf of counsel.

William Schall et al., Petitioners

Frederick Camors et al., Trustees, &c.,

This cause was argued by Mr. Ralph S. Rounds, for the Petitioners and by Mr. Monte M. Lemann for the respondents.

89

N. A. Sullivan,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The City of Shreveport.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. N. Randolph for the Plaintiff in error and by Mr. James E. Smitherman for the defendant in error.

91

Postal Telegraph Cable Company,
Petitioner
vs.
Warren Goodwin Lumber Company,
Respondent.

This cause was argued by Mr. Ellis B. Cooper for the Petitioner and, Submitted by Mr. William O. Anderson for the respondent.

101

Godchaux Company, Incorporated
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Albert Estopinal, Jr., Sheriff &c. et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. R. C. Milling for

Monday, November 17th 1919, continued.

The plaintiff in error and continued by Mr. Williams Winans Hall for the defendants.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, November 18th 1919—

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph R. McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Pierson, it is ordered that Joseph H. Higgins, Esquire, of Nashville, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. E. Stuckert it is ordered that Joseph L. Donald-

(Tuesday, November 18th 1919, continued)

Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. C. A. McNary it is ordered that Walter M. Evans, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. W. Hastings, it is ordered that Ray McNaughton, Esquire, of Miami, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

A. A. Ausglund,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The State of Oregon.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon.

120

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, and this cause having been called to the

Evans, of counsel for the defendant in error and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation and motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Northern Pacific Railway Company,
Defendant,
109 vs.
The United States;

Seaboard Air Line Railway,
Defendant
132 vs.
The United States;

The New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Company,
Defendant,
133 vs.
The United States;

(Tuesday, November 18th 1919, continued.)

232 Kansas City, Mexico & Orient Railway Company of Texas, Appellant, vs. The United States.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General, it is ordered that these cases be, and the same are hereby passed to be restored to the call pursuant to section 9 of Rule 26.

101 Godchaux Company, Inc., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Albert Estopinal, Jr., Sheriff &c., et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. William Winans Wall for the defendants in error and concluded by Mr. R. E. Milling for the plaintiff in error.

103 The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Mill Creek and Mine Hill Navigation & Railroad Company, &c.;

(Tuesday, November 18th. 1919, continued.)

America,
(Plaintiff in Error,)
104 vs.
North Pennsylvania
Railroad Company
&c.;

The United States
of America,
(Plaintiff in Error,)
105 vs.
Delaware & Bound
Brook Railroad
Company &c.

These cases were argued by Mr William L. Frierson for the Plaintiff in error and by Mr. William Clarke Mason for the defendant in error.

Clinton N. Pierce,
et al,
(Plaintiffs in Error,)
234 vs.
The United States
of America.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Frederick A. Mohr, for the Plaintiffs in error and continued by Mr. Robert P. Stewart for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, November 19th 1919 —

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamations being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. E. Strickett it is ordered that Stephens L. Blakely Esquire, and Lewis F. Brown, Esquire of Covington, State of Kentucky be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas G. Hagga-

Wagaman, Esquire of Hagerstown State of Maryland be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. Prescott Gatley it is ordered that Edward R. Whittingham Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward J. McCann, it is ordered that Edgar Lee Graever, Esquire, of Tazewell, State of Virginia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John H. Price, it is ordered that J.S. Ashworth, Esquire, of Bristol, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Wednesday, November 19th, 1919, continued.

113 E. Viegelmann and Company, Petitioner, vs. Mr. Sneular Collector of Customs. On petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

It is ordered by the Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of prosecution.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

114 Peter L. Wheeler, et al., as Trustees &c., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. City of Oakland. It is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed, pursuant to the 26th Rule.

115 Jefferson C. Powers et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The City of Richmond. This cause was submitted to the considera tion of the Court by Mr. Robert M. Dalby for the plaintiffs in error and Mr. Henry R. Pollard for the defen dant in error.

Wednesday, November 19th, 1919, continued.

Clinton N. Pierce et al. Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
234 The United States of America.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Frederick A. Mohr for the Plaintiffs in error.

The United States Petitioner
vs.
29 William B. Poland et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Roberts for the Petitioner and by Mr. Ira Bronson and Mr. George N. Patrick, for the respondents.

Oklahoma Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
106 Severns Paving Company et al.

The argument in this cause was commenced by Mr. John B. Dudley for the Plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. H. A. Richardson and ~~concluded~~ by Mr. Henry G. Snyder, for the Plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Thursday, November 20th, 1919.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter D. Noyes, it is ordered that Arthur L. Strasser, Esquire, Clarence M. Lewis, Esquire, and Moses J. Stroock, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L.

Thursday, November 20th 1919, continued

Sinclair Merrill Russell, Esquire, and William V. Gregory, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, and Newton Hunter Harlow, Esquire, of Staunton, State of Virginia be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Park, it is ordered that Paul D. Bryan, Esquire, of Moultrie, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles J. Kappler it is ordered that Karl J. Knoepfler, Esquire, of Walthill, State of Nebraska be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Crain, it is ordered that Newton N. Porter, Esquire and Harrison P. Lindabury, Esquire of Newark, State of New Jersey, John T.

(Thursday, November 20th 1919, continued.)

State of Missouri and William S. Simon, Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as attorney and counsellor of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.)

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Levy Mayer it is ordered that David (4) Rosenthal, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.)

589 Elwood Hamilton, Collector of Internal revenue &c., Appellant, vs. Kentucky Distilleries & Warehouse Company.

On motion of Mr. H. B. Wheeler, leave is granted him to file a brief as amicus curiae in this cause.

116 Sarah J. Briggs, Administratrix, &c. Plaintiff in Error, vs. Union Pacific Railroad Company.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the

Thursday, November 20th 1919, continued.

G. Waters for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. N. N. Loomis and Mr. P. M. Lillard for the defendant in error.

106 Oklahoma Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Severns Paving Company, et al.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. N. G. Snyder for the plaintiff in error.

589 Elwood Hamilton, collector of Internal Revenue &c., Appellant, vs. Kentucky Distilleries & Warehouse Company,

This cause was argued by Mr. William L. Pierson for the appellant and by Mr. Levy Mayer and Mr. William Marshall Bullitt for the appellee.

602 Alphons Hoy Foos, et al., Appellants, vs. William N. Edwards collector of Internal Revenue &c.

On motion of Mr. Levi Cooke, leave is hereby granted him to file brief as amicus curiae in this

(Thursday, November 20th, 99, continued.)

Alphonse Dreyfoos et al,
Appellants,
602 vs.
William H. Edwards,
Collector of Internal Revenue &c.

This cause was argued by Mr. Walter C. Noyes for the appellants and by Mr. Solicitor General King for the appellee.

Jacob Ruppert, a corporation,
Appellant,
603 vs.
Francis G. Caffey
U.S. Attorney &c.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Elihu Root for the appellant.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Friday, November 21st 1919

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorables Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. N. P. Fisher, it is ordered that R. S. Maguire, Esquire of Newton, State of Mississippi be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Crain, it is ordered that Charles A. Pagan, Es-

(Friday, November 21st 1919, continued)

be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

The Hartford Poster Advertising Company, Appellant,

vs.

149 Thomas D. Egan, Chief of the State Police of the State of Connecticut.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Connecticut.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby dismissed without costs to either party.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Jacob Ruppert, a corporation, Appellant,

603 vs.

United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York et al. — On motion of Mr. Elihu Root for the appellant one hour of additional time was allowed for the argument of this cause.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Elihu Root for the appellant; by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Pierson and Mr. Solicitor General King for the appellees and concluded by Mr. William D. Guthrie for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at twelve o'clock.

Monday, November 24th 1919.

Pursuant to adjournment this Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney,
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. William C. Rogers it is ordered that Richard James Van Hausen, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia and Charles M. Pammell, Esquire, of Lakeland, State of Florida be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward D. Baldwin it is ordered that Clarence N.

of Rhode Island be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General King it is ordered that Robert N. Perkins, Esquire, of Richmond, State of Virginia and Hick O. Perrill, Esquire of San Antonio, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Pierson, it is ordered that Sam E. Whitaker, Esquire, of Chattanooga, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Henry Butler it is ordered that Henry P. Molloy, Esquire, of New York, City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Monday, November 24th 99, Continued

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Dillman it is ordered that Judge Vaughan, Esquire of Little Rock, State of Arkansas and Emil Gumpert, Esquire of Stockton, State of California be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Calvin T. Milam, it is ordered that Eugene V. Myers, Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, it is ordered that A.W. Wood, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Borah, it is ordered that Ariel C. Cherry, Esquire of Weiser, State of Idaho be

and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.)

276 Robert P. Stroud, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America. — In error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas.

(This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.)

(Per Mr. Justice Day.)

188 Georgia M. Houston, Administratrix of John Houston, deceased, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Seaboard Air Line Railway Company. — In error to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

(This cause came on to be heard on

Monday, November 21st 1892, continued.

Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. S. M. Bollis. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee.

S.C.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

544. Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. T. W. Bollis. On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is ordered that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

334. Southern Pacific Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Leo L. O'Utassy. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Erie Railroad Company,

Monday, November 24th 1919, continued.

348 vs. William M. Collins. On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 5th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Erie Railroad Company, Petitioner vs. Antoni Szary. On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 5th, next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

355

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

North Brothers Company, Petitioner, vs. Ephraim Lederer, Collector of Internal Re-

525

Monday, November 24th 1919, continued.

District of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of this motion to advance this cause. It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 5th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Forged Steel Wheel Company, Petitioner

526 vs.

C. T. Lewellyn, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty Third District of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause. It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 5th next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Carbon Steel Company, Petitioner

535 vs.

Monday, November 24th, 1919, continued.

C. E. Jewell Lyn, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania. — On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 5th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Frank Shaffer, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

419

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the Argument of counsel therein had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

563 Inter-Urban Railway Company and London Guarantee & Accident Company, Petitioners, vs. Mrs. Fred Smith

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa and of the argument of counsel therein had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

598 Bascom C. Thomson, Petitioner vs. The United States of America.

Eighth Circuit.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the

Monday, November 24th 1919, continued.

as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

591 Matty McLaughlin, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America. (The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the defendant in error.)

362 The Coca Cola Company, (Petitioner) vs. The Kotke Company of America et al. (Substitution of The Coca Cola Company of Delaware for the Coca Cola Company of Georgia and the appearance of the Coca Cola Company of Delaware as the party Petitioner herein filed and entered on motion of Mr. R. M. Pholps in behalf of counsel for the Petitioner.

The State of Nevada, Complainant.

Crown Willamette Paper Company, to bill of complaint, on motion of Mr. Evans Browne, in behalf of counsel for the defendant.

Leave granted to file answer of defendant

The State of Nevada, Complainant
20 Orig'l. vs.
Crown Willamette Paper Company,

The motion of complainant to strike out certain parts of the answer of the defendant to the bill of complaint was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. C. Calhoun in behalf of Mr George B Thatcher for the complainant in support of the motion and by Mr. Oscar Sutro and Mr. H. St. Orick for the defendant in opposition thereto.

The State of Nevada, Complainant,
20 Orig'l. vs.
Crown Willamette Paper Company.

On motion of Mr. C. C. Calhoun, in behalf of counsel for the complainant, leave is granted to file the reply of the complainant to the answer of the defendant to the bill

Monday, November 21st 1892, (continued.)

of complaint.

Philadelphia & Reading Railway Company, (Plaintiff in Error,) vs. Margaret L. Hancock. 415

The motion to place this case on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hannis Taylor for the defendant in error,

The Toledo & Cincinnati Railroad Company et al. (Petitioners) vs. The Equitable Trust Company of New York et al. 595

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Morrison R. Waite and Mr. John Randolph Schindel for the petitioners and by Mr. Murry Seasongood for the respondents.

Chicago, Duluth, & Georgian Bay Transit Company, owner &c., (Petitioner

Monday, November 24th 1919, continued.

Charles P. Moore et al. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles E. Kremer for the petitioners and by Mr. George E. Brand for the respondents.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, December the 8th next, at twelve o'clock.

Monday, December 8th, 1919.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

(Mark K. Green, Esquire, Marshal),
(James D. Maher, Clerk);

(Proclamation) being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Douglas Brookman, it is ordered that D. L. Beard, Esquire, and Harvey N. Sanborn, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General

Sellacy, Esquire, of Hartford State of Connecticut and Roberts Z. W. Rodgers, of Buffalo, State of Newyork, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert P. Stewart it is ordered that Martin Lee Clark, Esquire of Buffalo, State of Newyork, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel Herrick it is ordered that Paul G. Ellis, Esquire of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry D. Rainey it is ordered that James Arthur Miller, Esquire of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Monday, December 8th. 1919, continued.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John A. Kratz Jr., it is ordered that Henry Root Storrs, Esquire of Newyork City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Warren, it is ordered that John V. Preston, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward S. McDermott, it is ordered that Alexander M. Bremer, Esquire of Newyork City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. Stanton C. Peelle, it is ordered that Jerome L. Van Wormer, Esquire of Reno State

as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles M. Needham, it is ordered that William Lewis Parsons, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf, by Mr. Downey Johnston, it is ordered that William B. White, Esquire, of Birmingham, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Malcolm E. Rosser, it is ordered that John A. Chumbley, Esquire, of Manchester, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. Walton Moore, it is ordered that John Martin Peery, Esquire, of Staunton, and Blue

Monday, December 8th 1919, (continued)

son King Esquire) of Christian Forge, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Addison H. Smith it is ordered that Edgar L. Ashton Esquire) of Twin Falls, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lawrence J. Heller it is ordered that William Koch, Esquire) of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Simon Lyon, it is ordered that Morgan Harrell, Esquire) and Norman Fischer, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were

Monday, December 8th 1919, continued.)

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf, by Mr. Nelle Goody Koontz, it is ordered that Edd. Noonchester, Esquire, of Williamson, State of West Virginia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clement L. Bouvé it is ordered that Louis S. Beedy, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, it is ordered that Blaine Mallan, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter S. Penfield it is ordered that Americus V. Andrews, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California be admitted to

(Monday, December 8th 1919, continued.)

attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Dyke, it is ordered that Ormond Simkins, Esquire, of Corsicana, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. Clarence Aiken, it is ordered that James S. Y. Irvine, Esquire, of Albany, and Ralph Averill Kellogg, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of New York, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Griggs, it is ordered that Thomas F. McGrann, Esquire, of Paterson, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Monday, 6 December 8th. 1919, continued)

On motion, leave made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William G. Prentiss, it is ordered that William Woodburn, Esquire of Reno, State of Nevada, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn according by.

106

Oklahoma Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Severns Paving Company, and the City of Oklahoma City, Defendants in Error.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be modified as indicated in the opinion of this Court, and as so modified be, and the same is hereby affirmed, each party to pay one half of the costs in this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds

Monday, December 8th. 1919, continued.

Thomas J. Evans, Sole Surviving Receiver of the Citizens & Screven County Bank, Petitioner
vs.
National Bank of Savannah.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia.

67

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Pitney
Mr. Justice Brandeis
Mr. Justice Clarke.

Henry Peters, Eugene Peters and Aetna Life Insurance Company, Plaintiffs in Error,

47

Monday, December 8th, 1919, continued.

Nellie Veasey, Administratrix of the Succession of Thomas Veasey, deceased. — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Brandeis
Mr. Justice Clarke.

74

The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Company, Appellant — Appeals from the Court of Claims

vs.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court

Monday, December 8th 1919, continued.)

and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby affirmed.)

(Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Corsicana National Bank of Corsicana, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Samuel Tristan Johnson. 23

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.)

This cause came on to be heard on the Transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the

District of Texas for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

(Per Mr. Justice Pitney.)

William D. Wagner, Edward Wagner, and Sophie Wagner, partners doing business under the firm name of W. D. Wagners' Sons, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The City of Covington. } In error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

61

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

(Per Mr. Justice Pitney.)

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna.
Mr. Justice Holmes.

Andrew C. Gilligan, doing business under the name of The Eagle

Monday, December 8th 1919, continued.)

62 Bottling Works, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The City of Covington. In error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney,
Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna
Mr. Justice Holmes.

22 Talbot Darby Bragg, Plaintiff in Error, vs. R. S. Weaver, and N. Plaintiff in. In error to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the

by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

66

St Louis, Iron Mountain and Southern Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Hickey Williams and Lucy Williams.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

ndays, December 8th, 1919, continued

Liverpool, Brazil & Rivers Plate Steam Navigation Company, Petitioners, vs. Brooklyn Eastern District Terminal. (On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Chicago Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs.

Eva Roberts Cole, as Administratrix of the Estate of A. N. Roberts, deceased for herself, Sarah P. Roberts, Claude Roberts and Barnum Roberts.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The City of Los Angeles et al,

Appellants,

vs.

Los Angeles Gas and Electric Corporation.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California.

50

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States

Monday, December 8th 1919, continued.

the Southern District of California and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Pitney,

Mr. Justice Clarke.

Robert P. Ervien, Commissioner of Public Lands of the State of New Mexico,

Appellant,

vs.

The United States of America.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

72

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said

peals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of New Mexico.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

31

Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Police Court of the City of Sacramento, State of California, and Hon. J. J. Henderson, Judge Thereof, et al.

In error to the District Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the Transcript of the record from the District Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court of Appeal in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, December 8th 1919, continued

Postal Telegraph-Cable Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
91 Warren-Godwin Lumber Company.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for the further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Pitney.

Jefferson C. Powers,
Arthur L. Powers,
Jane Powers Collins,
et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
115 vs.
The City of Richmond

In error to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

Monday, December 8th 1919, continued.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of Error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per M. Chief Justice White.

103

The United States of America
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Mill Creek Coal Mine Still Navigation and Railroad Company, to use of Philadelphia and Reading Railway Company, Lessee.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the judgment of the

Monday, December 8th 1919, continued.

District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. North Pennsylvania Railroad Company, to use of Philadelphia & Reading Railway Company, Lessee. 104. In error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, 105

Delaware and Bound Brook Railroad Company, to use of Philadelphia & Reading Railway Company, Lessee.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Sarah J. Briggs, Administratrix of the Estate of Earl H. Briggs, deceased,

Plaintiff in Error

vs.

Union Pacific Railroad Company.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

116

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kans

and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.)

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

591 Matty McLaughlin, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America. — On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 5th next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

415 Philadelphia & Reading Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Margaret L. Hancock. — On consideration of the motion to place this cause on the summary docket, It is now here ordered by the Court that the

Monday, December 8th 1919, continued.

hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

20 Orig. The State of Nevada, Complainant, vs. Crown Willamette Paper Company. On consideration of the motion to strike out part of the answer herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied, without prejudice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

594 Chicago, Duluth, and Georgian Bay Transit Company, Owner of the Steamship "South American" Petitioner vs. Charles T. Moore et al. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby

Monday, December 8th 1919, continued.

denied.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White).

The Toledo & Cincinnati Railroad Company, Judson Harmon and Rufus B. Smith, Receivers of the Cincinnati, Hamilton and Dayton Railway Company, Petitioners

595 vs.

The Equitable Trust Company of New York et al.

On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White)

Monday, December 8th, 1919, continued.

56 Peter Geddes et al., Appellants, vs. Anaconda Copper Mining Company et al. — It is ordered by the Court that this cause be restored to the docket for re-argument.

Mr. Chief Justice White delivered the opinion of the Court.

618 First National Bank of Canton, Pennsylvania, Appellant, vs. John Skelton Williams, Comptroller of Currency. — The motions to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the appellee.

413 The United States at the relation of Kansas City Southern Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Interstate Commerce Commission. — On motion of Mr. H. G. Brautley, leave is granted him to file brief as amicus curiae on behalf of various railroads in this cause.

Monday, December 8th, 1919, continued

The Penn Mutual Life Insurance Company, Petitioner,
499 vs.
Ephraim Lederer, Collector of Internal Revenue.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John A. Kratz, Jr., in behalf of Mr. George Wharton Pepper, for the petitioners.

Chipman Limited, Plaintiff in Error,
516 vs.
The Thomas B. Jeffrey Company.

This cause was advanced and submitted to the consideration of the Court under the thirty second rule on motion of Mr. Louis Marshall in behalf of Mr. Daniel P. Hayes for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Philip B. Adams and Mr. Thomas M. Kearney for the defendant in error.

The State of Washington, Petitioner
590 vs.
Isaac Belna.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to

Monday, December 8th 919, continued.

Douglas Brookman in behalf of Mr. L. L. Thompson and Mr. M. V. Tannier for the petitioner.

609 The State of Missouri, Appellant, vs. Ray P. Holland, U.S. Game Warden. Appellee. — Mr. motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John T. Gore for the appellant.

616 Emma Pell Peters, Petitioner vs. The United States of America. — Mr. petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. C. Johnson in behalf of Mr. Marshall B. Woodworth for the petitioners and by Mr. Robert P. Stewart and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

543 Knickerbocker Ice Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Lillian E. Stewart. — On motion of Mr. Warren H. Pillsbury on behalf of the

onday, December 8th 1919, continued

Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California, leave is hereby granted him to file brief as amicus curiae in this cause.

Seaboard Air Line Railway, Appellant, vs. The United States.

On motion of Mr. L. D. Mickinnon on behalf of the Minneapolis St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company, leave is hereby granted him to file brief as amicus curiae in this cause.

Eugene M. Travis as Comptroller of the State of New York, Appellant, vs. The Yale & Towne Manufacturing Co.

On motion of Mr. John M. Grigg, on behalf of the State of New Jersey, leave is hereby granted him to file brief as amicus curiae in this cause.

Eugene M. Travis as Comptroller of the State of New York, Appellant

Monday, December 8th 19, continued

The Salt Towne Manufacturing Company.

On motion Mr. Laur... Arnold ... on behalf ...

a conference of mayors and other officials of the State of New York, ... is hereby granted him to file brief ... amicus curiae) herein.

611

J. R. Smith and B. J. Ostrander, Petitioners

vs.

The Steamer "J. J. Hill," etc. The Pittsburgh Steamship Company, claimant.

The petition ... a writ of ... certiorari ... in) was ... mitted to ... consideration ... of the Court ... by Mr. ... H. Goulder ... Charles E. ... mer and Mr. Frank S. Bright for the petitioners and by Mr. Sherman A. ... and Mr. G. H. Cothrell for the respondent.

192

Morgenthaler Linotype Company, Plaintiff in Error,

vs.

Samuel H. Davis et al.

This motion ... to dismiss ... in this ... cause ... submitted ... to the con... sideration of the Court by Mr. Edgar

A. Green and Mr. J. C. Shepard for the defendants in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Bradford Butler for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

583 Louis Drago, Petitioner vs. Central Railroad Company of New Jersey. (The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander Simpson for the petitioner and by Mr. James H. Carpenter, Jr., for the respondent.)

592 Missouri Kansas & Texas Railway Company et al. Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Hannah L. Zuber. (The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph M. Bryson, Mr. Clifford L. Jackson, Mr. Gardiner Lathrop, Mr. J. R. Cottingham, Mr. Samuel W. Hayes, Mr. Alexander Britton and Mr. C. S. Burg, for the plaintiffs in error in support of the

Monday, December 8th 1919, continued.

Howard Brown,
Petitioner
vs.
605. The United States
of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. P. Henshall for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart for the respondent.

Reward Oil Company,
Petitioner
vs.
606 Petroleum Rectifying Company of California.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William K. White for the petitioner and by Mr. Frederick P. Fish, Mr. John H. Miller and Mr. J. H. Buckenstein for the respondents.

Wil. Maynard et al,
Petitioners
vs.
624 United Thacker Coal Company.

The petitions for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ed Noonchester and Mr. H. H. Scott for the petitioners.

Monday, December 8th, 1919, continued.)

George A. Cole et al,
(Petitioners)
172 & 173 vs.
Joseph Ralph.

These cases were argued by Mr. George B. Thatcher for the Petitioners and by Mr. Samuel Herrick and Mr. P. G. Ellis for the respondent.)

Pennsylvania Gas Company,
(Plaintiff in Error,)
330 vs.
Public Service Commission Second District of the State of New York, et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by by Mr. John E. Mullin for the Plaintiff in Error and continued by Mr. Ledyard P. Hale, for the defendants in error.)

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, December 9th, 1919

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met to day at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis Marshall it is ordered that Hugo Pam, Esquire; Harry M. Fisher, Esquire; and Samuel Edward Hirsch, Esquire of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Williams

Tuesday, December 9th, 1919, continued.

L. Marbury, it is ordered that Michael J. Lynch, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline it is ordered that William A. Clarke, Jr., Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sidney Anderson, it is ordered that Henry M. Gallagher, Esquire, of Wasca, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

230 Pennsylvania Gas Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Public Service Com-

No argument of this cause was continued by

(Tuesday, December 9th, 1919, continued.)

yard P. Dales and Mr. Louis L. Brasher for the defendants in error and concluded by Mr. John E. Mullin for the plaintiff in error.

Tom T. Carlisle, British Consul General,
Appellant,
vs.
351. Charles Glen Collins.

On motion of Mr. Charles Dox in that behalf, It is ordered that this cause be advanced for hearing with No. 350.

Charles Glen Collins,
Appellant,
vs.
350 Frank M. Miller
U.S. Marshall, &c.;
and
Tom T. Carlisle, British
Consul General,
Appellant,
vs.
351 Charles Glen Collins.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. J. Zach Spearing for Collins, continued by Mr. Charles Dox for the appellee in no 350 and the appellant in No 351, and concluded by Mr. Guion Miller for Collins.

Tuesday, December 9th, 1919, continued

Strathearn Steamship Company, Ltd.,
Petitioners
373 vs.
John Dillon;
and
J. M. Thompson, Master and Claimant of the Steamship "Westmeath" etc.,
Petitioners,
391 vs.
Peter Lucas et al.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. L. de Grove Potter for the Petitioners in No. 391, continued by Mr. Frederic R. Coudert for the British Embassy, by special leave of Court, by Mr. George Sutherland for the respondent in No. 373, by Mr. Solicitor General King for the United States by special leave of Court, by Mr. W. J. Waguespack for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. Howard Thayer Kingsbury for the British Embassy, by special leave of Court, and cast submitted by Mr. Ralph James M. Bullowa for the Petitioner in No. 373.

Proclamation being made, the Court is ad-

Wednesday, December 10th, 1919.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Rufus S. Day, it is ordered that Abraham A. Rolf, Esquire; Walter F. Olds, Esquire; Eben Carl Rourke, Esquire, and Elmer D. Brothers, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick D.

(Wednesday, December 10th 1919, continued)

Court it is ordered that Henry V. Blaxter, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. A. Danzer it is ordered that Henry A. Rubino, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Graham it is ordered that Frank E. Sigheimer, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward M. Deary it is ordered that William Morrison Smith, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and

Wednesday, December 10th, 1919, continued)

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clare R. Chindblom, it is ordered that Emanuel Eller, Esquire); Willis Melville, Esquire); Harry B. Miller, Esquire); Rupert D. Bigbus, Esquire) and Edgar A. Jones, Esquire), of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward S. Brashears, it is ordered that William H. Boies, Esquire) of Sheldon, and John N. Mohr, Esquire) of Sioux City, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

The United States of America, on the relation of Alexander Beckman, Petitioner,

No.— vs.

A. Caminetti, Commissioner General of Immigration, et al;

406

413

dnesday, December 10th 1919, continued.)

The United States of America) on the relation of Emma Goldman,

Appellant.

vs.

W. Caminetti, Commissioner General of Immigration, et al.

Appellees.

The application for a writ of certiorari in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry Weinberger for the appellant and by Mr. Robert P. Stewart for the appellees.

The Atherton Mills,

Appellant,

vs.

Eugene P. Johnston et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Divine and Mr. Solicitor General King for the United States by special leave of Court, and by Mr. F. M. Hendren, for the appellees.

The United States of America) on the relation of Kansas City Southern Railway Company,

Plaintiff in Error,

vs.

Wednesday, December 10th 1919, continued.)

Commission. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Louis Marshall for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. P. J. Farrell for the defendant in error and concluded by Mr. Samuel H. Moore, for the plaintiff in error.)

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Thursday, December 11th 1919

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William A. Meese it is ordered that Walter Rothschild Esquire of San Francisco, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General

(Thursday, 4th December 11th, 1919, continued.)

Esquire) of Toledo, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mrs. Ellen Spencer Mussey, it is ordered that Sarah Rowena Beck, of Owego, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas S. Crago, it is ordered that Joseph S. V. Smith, Esquire, of New Castle, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles T. Littmann it is ordered that Edwin M. Borchard, Esquire of New Haven, State of Connecticut be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn according ly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James S. [illegible]

(Thursday, December, 11th, 1919, continued.)

it is ordered that Jerome L. Chaney, Esquire, of Syracuse, State of New York be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly. ()

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. A. Elston, it is ordered that William A. Sutherland Esquire, of Fresno, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly. ()

No. — Alexander Berkman, vs A. Caminetti, Commissioner of Immigration, etc.

This is an application for a writ of error or appeal and for admission to bail and for a stay order addressed to the Commissioner of Immigration concerning an order for deportation, seeking to review an application for writ of habeas corpus which was denied.

The application for a writ of error or appeal is refused and the

denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

No. — Emma Goldman,
vs.
Alexander Sabbatini, Commissioner of Immigration, etc.

This is an application for writ of error or an appeal from an order of the Court below refusing an application for writ of habeas corpus to release from an order for deportation and an application for stay and bail. In this case the consideration of the application for writ of error or appeal is postponed to the opening of the Court on this week, and the parties are directed to print and submit with the application the record as to the habeas corpus. The documents accompanying same, a stay is ordered until this application is disposed of and until further order of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

The United States of America, Plaintiff-in-Error,
458 vs.
Standard Brewery, Incorporated.

Thursday, December 11th, 1919, (continued.)

On motion of Mr. William J. Donovan in that behalf, leave is hereby granted to file brief of Wayne B. Wheeler and Andrew Wilson, as amicus curiae in this cause.

245 Agnes Smedley and Sailendra Nath Ghose, Appellants, vs. Thomas H. McCarthy, United States Marshal for the Southern District of New York. } Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

It appearing to this Court that a motion of counsel for the appellants to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered adjudged and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

458 The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Standard Brewery, Incorporated,

Thursday, December 11th 1919, continued.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. American Brewing Company, 474

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William L. Marbury for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. William L. Marbury for the defendant in error in No. 438, by Mr. Elihu Root for the defendant in error in No. 474, and concluded by Mr. Solicitor General King for the plaintiff in error.

Charles B. Shaffer, Appellant, vs. Frank C. Carter, State Auditor, etc., et al. 531 and 580.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. M. E. Rosser for the appellant, and continued by Mr. C. W. King and Mr. S. A. Reeling for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock

Friday, December 12th 1919.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Kirby, it is ordered that Ohmer C. Burnside, Esquire, of Lake Village, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Oscar H. Underwood, it is ordered that Oscar W. Under-

Thursday, December 12th 1918, continued

State of Alabama be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn according ly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Stitt it is ordered that Henry N. Keedy, Jr., Esquire, of Hagerstown, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn according ly.

Charles B. Shaffer, Appellant,
531 and 580. vs.
Frank C. Carter, State Auditor, etc., et al.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. S. P. Dreeling for the appellees.

Silverthorne Lumber Company, Inc., et al, Plaintiffs in Error,
358 vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was argued by Mr. W. O. Guthrie for the plaintiffs in error and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart for the defendant in error.

Friday, December 12th 1919, continued

219. Producers Transportation Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Railroad Commission of California et al., Defendants in Error. This cause was argued by Mr. A. V. Andrews for the Plaintiff in error and by Mr. Douglas Brookman for the defendants in error.

401 Napa Valley Electric Company, Appellant, vs. The Railroad Commission of the State of California et al., Appellees. This cause was argued by Mr. H. L. Beard for the Appellant and by Mr. Douglas Brookman for the Appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at twelve o'clock.

Monday, December 15th 1919

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna.
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

89

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Frierson it is ordered that Hugh P. Shelton, Esquire, of Columbia, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carlos Bee, it is ordered that Harold C. Smith, Esquire, of Corpus Christi, State of Texas

Monday December 15th 1919, continued:

be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court on this behalf by Mr. Sill Sam H. Hastings it is ordered that H. Harrold Esquire, of Oklahoma City; and Russell B. Brown Esquire, Ardmore, State of Oklahoma be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

W. A. Sullivan,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
City of Shreveport

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is hereby ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Monday, December 15th 1919, continued.)

10 The Hardin-Wyandot Lighting Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Village of Upper Sandusky. } In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

(Mr. Justice Day took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.).

Elwood Hamilton, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Collection District of Kentucky, Defendant, 589 vs. Kentucky Distilleries

602

Monday, December 15th 1919. continued.

Warehouse Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court with directions to dismiss the bill.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Alphonse Hry Foos, Eugene Blum and Eugene Bascho, Appellants,

vs.

William N. Edwards, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second Collection District of New York.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Monday, December 15th 1919, continued.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

63

Frank A. Bone, Petitioner
vs.
Commissioner of Marion County.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby re-

309

Monday, December 15th 1919. (continued)

manded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Indiana.

(Per Mr. Justice McKenna.)

The United States of America, Appellant, vs. The Board of County Commissioners of Osage County, Okla homa et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma, for further proceedings in conformity with the Opinion of this Court.

Monday, December 15th 1919, continued.

The Penn Mutual Life Insurance Company, Petitioner
vs.
1499 Ephraim Lederer, Collector of Internal Revenue.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 1st next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The State of Missouri, Appellant,
vs.
609 Ray P. Holland, United States Game Warden.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 1st next after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

First National Bank, of Canton, Pennsylvania, Appellant

Monday, December 15th, 91, continued

618 vs. John Skelton Williams, Comptroller of the Currency. On consideration of the motion to advance this cause it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday March 1st next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railway Company, Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company et al. Plaintiffs in Error, 592 vs. Hannah L. Zuber. On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted, the transcript of the record on the writ of error to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Louis Drago, Petitioner 583

Central Railroad Company of New Jersey.

State of New Jersey.

On petition for writ of certiorari to Circuit Court Hudson Co

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Circuit Court of Hudson County, State of New Jersey, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court, that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Chief Justice

590. The State of Washington, Petitioner

vs.

Isaac Belkna[illegible].

State of Washington.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Monday, December 15th, 1919, continued.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

	Howard Brown, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.	On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.
605		

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

	Reward Oil Company, Petitioner vs. Petroleum Rectifying Company of California.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.
606		

On consideration of the petition

Monday, December 15th 1919, cont

United States Circuit Court of A
for the Ninth Circuit, and of the
ment of counsel thereupon) had, as well
argument of the same, it is now here ordere
this Court that the said petition
the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice

611. J. R. Smith and B. J. Ostrander, Petitioners vs. The Steamer "J. J. Hill" etc. Pittsburgh Steamship Company Claimant.

On pet
writ of
to the
States
Court
Seals
Seventh

On consideration of the pe
for a writ of certiorari directed to the
States Circuit Court of Appeals for
Seventh Circuit, and of the argume
counsel thereupon had, as well in
of as against the same, it is now
ordered by this Court that the sa
petition be, and the same is hereb
denied.

616 Emma Pell Fetters, Petitioner vs. The United States of America.

On petition
writ of certio
to the United
States Circu
Court of A

Monday, December 15th 1919, continued)

for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel therein for had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

624 Will Maynard, Thomas B. Maynard et al, Petitioners vs. United Thacker Coal Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel therein for had in support of the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Monday, December 15th 1919, continued

The Chief Justice announced that the Court will take a recess until Monday, the 22d instant to Wednesday, January 5th next.

591 Matty McLaughlin, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General for the defendant in error, and on behalf of counsel for the plaintiff in error, leave was granted to file brief as amicus curiae in this cause.

56. Peter Geddes et al, Appellants, vs. Anaconda Copper Mining Company et al.

On motion of Mr. P. J. Walsh, for the appellants, it is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby assigned for argument on Monday, March 1st next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

117 Matthew P. Chapman et al, Petitioners vs. John A. Wintrath.

Leave was granted to Melville Church to file brief as amicus curiae in this

Monday, December 15th, 1919, continued.

cause on motion of Mr. Alexander S. Stewart in that behalf.)

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Complainant,
23 Orig. vs.
The State of West Virginia.

On motions of Mr. A. Leo Weil for the complainant leave was granted to file the re-

(plication in this cause.)

The State of Ohio, Complainant,
24 Orig. vs.
The State of West Virginia.

On motion of Mr. A. Leo Weil (in behalf of counsel) for the complainant leave was granted to file the re-

(plication) in this cause.

The Seaboard Air Line Railway, Appellant,
132 vs.
The United States.

On motion of Mr. R. Stuart Knight in that behalf, leave was granted

him to file brief of the Bellefonte Central Railroad Company as amicus curiae in this cause.

Monday, December 15th 1919, contin

617 Ellsworth J. Nader,
(Petitioner)
vs.
The United States.

The Petit
for a w
certiora
herein
submitte

the consideration of the Court by
Blaine Mallan and Mr. St. Ral
Burton for the Petitioner and by
Robert P. Stewart and Mr. William
Herron for the respondent.

505 Arthur C. Gibson et al.,
Petitioners,
vs.
The United States of
America.

The Petit
for a w
certiora
herein
submitte
the consi

tion of the Court by Mr. William
Smith for the Petitioners and by
Robert P. Stewart and Mr. Harry
Ridgely for the respondents.

613 Charles F. Goodspeed,
Petitioner
vs.
Herbert E. Law.

The Petition
a writ of
tiorari her
was submi
to the consi

tion of the Court by Mr. Peter H. Kl
for the Petitioner and by Mr. Frank
Madison Mr. E.S. Pillsbury Mr. Al
Sutro, Mr. D.M. Pillsbury and Mr. C

Monday, December 15th 1919, continued.

Suits for the respondent.

121 Charles A. Hitchcock, Petitioner vs. Alfred G. Scattergood et al. On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed without costs to either party.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

407 The Baltimore and Ohio Southwestern Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Joseph T. Bailey. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

stipulation of counsel for the re
ive parties to dismiss the writ
ror in this cause has been fi
Therefore, in pursuance of sa
stipulation, it is now here orde
and adjudged by this Court, th
the writ of error in this cause, b
and the same is hereby dismi
Per Mr. Chief Justice W h

The Eastern Extension, Australasia and China Telegraph Company, Limited, Appellant,

357 vs.

The United States.

Mr. Claire for the appellee.

This cause
argued by
Mr. Louis
Marshal
for the ap
and by M
Assistant
Attorney

Eugene M. Mavis, Comptroller of the State of New York, Appellant,

548 vs.

The Yale & Towne Mfg. Company.

The argume
of this cause
was comm
by Mr. Jam
U. S. Supreme
the appellan
and continu
by Mr. Louis

Mr. Porter and Mr. Archibald Cox for the a
Proclamation being made the Court is ad
journed until tomorrow at twelve o'clock

Tuesday, December 16th 1919.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blacklow Esterline it is ordered that Francis E. McGovern, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Miller

Monday, December 15th 1919, continu

L. Lynch, Esquire, of Washington
District of Columbia, be admitte
to practice as our attorney and co
sellor of this Court, and he was
according ly.

On motion first made to the C
on this behalf by Mr. Richard S.
very, it is ordered that Edward
Lander, Esquire), of Town of Union
of New Jersey, and George W. Dick
Esquire), of New York City, be ad
mitted to practice as attorneys an
counsellors of this Court and the
were sworn according ly.

On motion first made to the
Court in this behalf by Mr. Ca
R. Childblom it is ordered that
(S.W. Rolnick, Esquire), of Chicago,
of Illinois, be admitted to practic
as an attorney and counsellor o
this Court, and he was sworn ac
cordingly.

William Wuhne,
Complainant,
No. — Orig'l. vs
The State of New
Jersey et al.

The motion for le
to file a bill of
complaint herein
was submitted
the consideration
of the Court by

Monday, December 15th 919, continued.)

George H. Tucker for the Complainant.

Eugene M. Travis, as Comptroller of the State of New York, Appellant,
548 vs.
The Yale & Towne Mfg. Company.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Archibald Cox for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Jerome L. Cheyney for the appellant.

Knickerbocker Ice Company, Plaintiff in Error,
543 vs.
Lillian E. Stewart.

On motion of Mr. Frank R. Savidge, leave is granted to file brief of Amicus Curiae in this cause.

Mark Ash as amicus curiae

Knickerbocker Ice Company, Plaintiff in Error,
543 vs.
Lillian E. Stewart.

This cause was argued by Mr. Frank R. Savidge for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Elclarence Aiken for the defendant in error.

Tuesday, December 16th 1919, (continued.)

166 International Bridge Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The People of the State of New York. by Mr. James S.Y. Swan for the defendant in error.

This cause was argued by Mr. Adelbert Moot, for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Swan for the defendant in error.

541 The United States of America et al, Appellants, vs. Alaska Steamship Company et al. Appellees.

The argument in this cause was commenced by Mr. Charles H. Needham for the appellants.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Wednesday, December 17th 1919 —

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol:

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green Esquire Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General King, it is ordered that Herbert A. Rice, Esquire, and Antonio A. Cadotoito, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ellis G.

Elfers, Esquire; and Lester S. Abberley, Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as our attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Crandall Mackey it is ordered that William C. MacInty, Esquire, of Cristobal, Canal Zone, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

No — Orig. The State of Rhode Island, Complainant, vs. A. Mitchell Palmer, Attorney General et al.

The motion for leave to file a bill of complaint in this cause was submitted to the consideration of this Court by Mr. Herbert A. Rice for the complainant.

117 Matthew T. Chapman, et al., Petitioners vs. John A. Wintroath, Engineering Companies of Allentown, Pa.

On motion of Mr. Selig Murray, leave is granted to file brief of The Fuller

sylvania), as amicus curiae in this cause.

110 Henry Parncomb et al, Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The City and County of Denver et al,

This cause was passed pursuant to the 26th Rule.

541. The United States of America et al, Appellants.
vs.
Alaska Steamship Company et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Roscoe H. Hupper, and Mr. Theodore H. Reath, for the appellees and concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Kuig for the appellants.

32 Oklahoma Gin Company, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The State of Oklahoma.
and
29 The Oklahoma Operating Company, Appellant,
vs.
J. E. Love et al, &c.

These cases were re-argued by Mr. C. B. Ames for the plaintiff in error in No. 32, and the appellant in No. 29, and by

Wednesday, December 17th, 1919, contin

Pleading for the defendant in erro
No. 32, and the appellees in No.

Northern Pacific
Railway Company
Appellant

109 vs.

The United States.

Brown for the appellees.

This cause
argued b
Mr. Alex
Britton for
appellant
by Mr. Lo

The Seaboard Air Line
Railway Company,
Appellant,

132. vs.

The United States.

Argument
menced b
Mr. Benj
min Car
for the
appellan

Proclamation being made, the Court
The is adjourned until tomorrow at
twelve o'clock.

Thursday, December 18th 1919

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

Coleman J. Ward, et al., Petitioners
vs.
The Board of County Commissioners of Love County, Oklahoma

224

On motion of Mr. S. P. Freeling, leave is granted to file brief as amicus curiae in this cause.

Thursday, December 18th 1919, continu

No. —

Emma Goldman,

vs.

A. Caminetti, Commissioner of Immigration, etc.

Leave gra
to withdr
application
writ of e
appeal
for stay
and bail) pending appeal on motio
Mr. Harry Steinberger for Emma G

118

Southern Pacific Company,

Petitioner

vs.

Industrial Accident Commission) of the State of California et al.

This cau
was sub
to the con
tion of th
Joint bo
Henley Co
and Mr
William
Herrin f
Petitioner and by Mr. Christopher T
Bradley, and Mr. Warren D. Pe
for the respondents.

132.

The Seaboard Air Line Railway,

Appellant,

vs.

The United States.

The argum
of this ca
was conti
by Mr. B
Carter f
appellant
Mr. LaRue Brown for the appellee
concluded by Mr Burr Carter for t
appellant.

Thursday, December 18th 1919, continued.

The New York Central & Hudson River Rail road Company, appellant,
vs.
133 The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. Frederic W. McKinney, for the appellant and by Mr. La Rue Brown for the appellee.

Kansas City Mexico & Orient Railway Company of Texas, appellant,
vs.
232 The United States.
appellee.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Carter Pope for the

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Friday, December 19th 1919

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice;
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. M. Hammond, it is ordered that Herbert C. Pooke, Esquire, of Salisbury, State of Maryland be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General King it is ordered that D. James O'Flaherty, Esquire, of Lincoln, State of

Friday, December 19th 1919, continued.

Nebraska, be admitted to practice as
an attorney and counsellor of this
Court and he was sworn accord-
ingly.

On motion first made to the
Court in this behalf by Mr. Owen
Wilson it is ordered that Cleveland
A. Newton, Esquire, and Abraham
B. Drew, Esquire, of St. Louis, State
of Missouri be admitted to practice
as attorneys and counsellors of this
Court, and they were sworn accord-
ingly.

On motion first made to the Court
in this behalf by Mr. J. A. Elston, it
is ordered that N. B. McClure, Esquire,
of Visalia, and N. E. Barbour, Esquire,
of Fresno, State of California be
admitted to practice as attorneys and
counsellors of this Court, and they were
sworn accordingly.

Agnes Smedley et al.
vs
Thomas H. McCarthy,
United States Mar-
shal &c.

The mandate in
this cause was
granted on
motion of Mr.
Solicitor Gen-
eral King.

Friday, December 19th, 1919, continue

Kansas City, Mexico & Orient Railway Company of Texas,
Appellant,
232 vs.
The United States,

General King for the appellee, and co
cluded by Mr. Alexander Britton
The appellant in no. 109.

Jett Bros. Distilling Company
Plaintiffs in Error,
108 vs.
City of Carrollton.

This cause
was arg
by Mr. A
Bruce fo
the plain
in error a
by Mr. W. E. Stricklett for the defendant in error.

Western Union Telegraph Company
Plaintiff in Error,
83 vs.
Peter Borgle.

This cau
was pul
mitted t
consideru
of the C
by Mr. R
Daggett and Mr. Francis Raymond Sta
for the plaintiff in error and by Mr.
Arthur H. Parry for the defendant in
error.

Friday, December 19th 1919, continued.

111 The Union Pacific Coal Company, Petitioner vs. Mark A. Skinner, Collector of Internal Revenue.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King & Mr. A. D. Meyer for the Respondent.

112 Wells Fargo & Company, Petitioner vs. Oscar L. Taylor.

This cause was argued by Mr. Charles H. Stockton for the Petitioner and by Mr. Thomas Dite Paine for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday at twelve o'Clock

Monday, December 22d 1919

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General King it is ordered that Arthur Key-man, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia and Henry D. Moyle, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. [illegible]

onday, December 22nd 1919, continued.)

ordered that A. M. Dambrison, Esquire
of Portland, State of Oregon be ad-
mitted to practice as attorney and
counsellor of this Court, and he was
sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court
in this behalf by Mr. Camden M.
McAtee, it is ordered that William Har-
man Black, Esquire, of New York City
be admitted to practice as an attorney
and counsellor of this Court and he
was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court
in this behalf by Mr. Wesley L. Jones,
it is ordered that R. R. Jeffris, Esquire
of Kennewick, State of Washington
be admitted to practice as an attorney
and counsellor of this Court, and he
was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the
Court in this behalf by Mr. Carlos
Lee, it is ordered that H. C. McAskill,
Esquire, and Sylvan Lang, Esquire, of
San Antonio, State of Texas, be ad-
mitted to practice as attorneys and
counsellors of this Court and they were
sworn accordingly.

Monday, December 22d 1919, continued

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick Taylor, it is ordered that J. Maurice Wormser, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly. ( )

J. H. Branson, Sheriff and Collector of Crawford County, and J. J. Cravens, A. B. Smith and R. T. Hamer, Commissioners of Road Improvement District No 2, Crawford County, Arkansas.

Appellants,

vs.

B. F. Bush, Receiver of the Property of St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Company.

(Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

82

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court, that the decree of the said

101

ndaq, December 22d 1919, continued.

United States Circuit Court of Ap-
eals in this cause be, and the same
is hereby reversed with costs, and that
the decree of the District Court of the
United States for the Western District
of Arkansas in this cause be, and the
same is hereby affirmed with costs;
and that this cause be, and the same
is hereby remanded to the said Dis-
trict Court.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice McReynolds.

odchaux Company,
Incorporated,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Albert Estopinal, Jr.,
Sheriff of the Parish
of St Bernard and the
Board of Drainage Com-
missioners of the Bayou
aux Aux Boeufs Drain-
age District.

In error to the
Supreme Court
of the State
of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the
anscript of the record from the Supreme
ourt of the State of Louisiana, and was
gued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now
s ordered and adjudged by this Court

and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

William Wilkins,
Complainant,
No. — Orig. vs.
The State of New Jersey, A. Mitchell Palmer, Attorney General of the United States, Joseph L. Bodine, United States Attorney in and for the District of New Jersey, and Daniel C. Roper, Commissioner of Internal Revenue of the United States.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file the bill of complaint herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that cause be shown by the State of New Jersey, A. Mitchell Palmer, Attorney General of the United States, Joseph L. Bodine, United States Attorney in and for the District of New Jersey, and Daniel C. Roper, Commissioner of Internal Revenue of the United States before this Court, at the City of Washington, on Monday, January 5th, 1920, at twelve o'clock noon of that day, or

Monday, December 22d 1919, continued.)

soon thereafter as counsel can be heard, why said motion should not be granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

State of Rhode Island, Complainant.
vs.
A. Mitchell Palmer, Attorney General, and Daniel C. Roper, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On consideration of the motion of counsel for the complainant for leave to file bill of complaint herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that cause be shown by A. Mitchell Palmer, Attorney General, and Daniel C. Roper, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, before this Court, at the City of Washington, on Monday, January 5th 1920 at 12 o'clock noon of that day, or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard, why said motion should not be granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Arthur C. Gilson &c.
Thomas J. Duffy
Petitioners
vs.
The United States of

On petition for a writ of certi
to the United States Circuit Court
of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition
a writ of certiorari herein to the Uni
States Circuit Court of Appeals for
Second Circuit and of the argumen
counsel therein, & it had as well in s
part of as against the same, it is n
hereby ordered by this Court that the sa
petition be, and the same is hereby
denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice W

613

Charles F. Goodhead,
Petitioner
vs.
Herbert E. Law.

On petition f
writ of certio
to the United
States Circui
Court of Ap

for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition f
a writ of certiorari herein to the Uni
States Circuit Court of Appeals for the
Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of
counsel as well in support of the same as against, it is
now here ordered by this Court that the
said petition be, and the same is hereby
denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice W

Monday, December 22, 1919, continued.)

617 Ellsworth J. Wrader, Petitioner vs. The United States. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel therein for had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

251 George J. Dwohey, Executor &c., Plaintiff in Error, vs. E. J. Horan, Commissioner of the Revenue, et al. The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. D. Hank, Jr. and Mr. John R. Saunders for the defendants in error and by Mr. George Mason Hilliard for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

The Kansas City Southern Railway Company et al.

Plaintiffs in error,

620 vs.

Road Improvement District Number 6. of Little River County, Arkansas.

Britton in behalf of Mr. James B. M
Monaugh and Mr. Samuel W. Moore
the plaintiffs in error in support of
petition and by Mr. William H. Arno
for the defendants in error in opposi
thereto, with leave to plaintiffs in erro
file printed record hereafter.

The Cle
for a w
of certio
herein w
submitte
the conc
tion of th
Court of
Alexandri

George R. Broadwell,

Petitioner,

289 vs.

The Board of County Commissioners of Carter County, Oklahoma.

The mot
to dism
herein
submitte
to the c
pudiate
of the C

by Mr. George B. Rittenhouse and Mr. C
A. Galbraith for the respondent in sup
port of the motion and by Mr. George
P. Glaze for the petitioner in opposite
thereto.

Monday, December 22d 1919, continued.

Carlos L. Byrons,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States of
America.

(The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward M. Cormyns, for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Nebeker and Mr. H. L. Underwood for the respondent.

604

Lillian B. Pemberton,
Petitioner,
vs.
Illinois Commercial)
Men's Association)

(The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harrison Musgrave and Mr. William S. Goldenheim for the petitioner and by Mr. James G. Condon for the respondent.

625

The Baltimore Dry Dock and Shipbuilding Company,
Petitioner
vs.
New York & Porto Rico
Steamship Company,
Owner &c. et al.

626

Monday, December 22nd 1919, continued.)

The Petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George Reems Williams for the Petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Sellacy, Mr. J. Hauk Staley, Mr. George Forbes and Mr. Ray Rood Allen for respondents.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday January 5th 1920 at 12 o'clock.

Monday,

Pursuan
Today a

The Hono

Hauk,
Jan

Proclama
Opened.

On
in this be
is ordered
of Henriet
mitted to
counsellor
sworn ac

On
in this be
it is orde

January 5th 1920.

At to adjournment this Court met
the Capitol.

Present:
Hon Edward D. White Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Wm. Grum Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Associate Justices.

tion being made the Court is

motion first made to the Court
half by Mr. L. H. Parrish is
that R. E. Taylor, Esquire),
ta, State of Texas be admi-
practice, as an attorney, and
of this Court and he was
ording by)

motion first made to the Court
half by Mr. Harry Peyton,
d that H. A. Johnson,

admitted to practice) as our attorney
counsellor of this Court and he w
sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the
Court in this behalf by Mr. J. B
Monroe it is ordered that Robert
Reid, Esquire, of Amite City, Stat
Louisiana, be admitted to practice
our attorney and counsellor of this C
and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the C
in this behalf by Mr. A.B. Renshaw
is ordered that Edward R. Wright
quire), of Santa Fe, State of New M
ico be admitted to practice as our
attorney and counsellor of this C
and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the
Court in this behalf by Mr. Georg
Sutherland, it is ordered that Rob
Phillips, Esquire), Edward N. Norton
Esquire), of Toledo, and William J. K
nealy, Esquire) of Youngstown, State
Ohio; and Samuel G. Nolin, Esquire)
of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania
be admitted to practice as our attorne
and counsellors of this Court and the
were sworn accordingly.

Monday, January 5th 1920, continued

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William S. Bennett it is ordered that Joseph M. Levine, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William P. Hall, it is ordered that B.F. Louis, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank D. Beigh, it is ordered that Frank Moore, Esquire, and Otho C. Jackson, Esquire of Lexington and O.B. Harvey, Esquire of Clifton Forge, State of Virginia be admitted to practice as attorney and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ottaman Hamele it is ordered that Richard J. Caffey, Esquire, of San Francisco

day, Esquire) of Washington, D
of Columbia), be admitted to Pr
as attorneys and counsellors of this
and they were sworn according ly.

On motion, first made to the
int this behalf by Mr. A. J. Ross
ordered that Anthony L. William
Esquire) of Wilkes-Barre, State
Pennsylvania) be admitted to
as an attorney and counsellor of
Court and he was sworn accordin

On motion, first made to the
Court in this behalf by Mr. Ar
Sim time it is ordered that Lawr
A. Lawlor, Esquire) of Lawrence, St
of Massachusetts be admitted to
Practice) as an attorney and cou
sellor of this Court, and he was
accordingly.

On motion, first made to the
by Mr Frederick, Dyer, it is or
that H. C. Miller, Esquire) of Colu
field, State of Pennsylvania, and
Paul J. Jones, Esquire) of Young
town, State of Ohio be admitted
(practice) as attorneys and counsell
of this Court, and they were sworn a
cordingly.

Monday, January 5th, 1929, (continued.)

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General King it is ordered that John M. Ryan Esquire of Buffalo, State of New York be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Douglas Fulton it is ordered that Harry M. Westfall, Esquire of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Jacob Ruppert, a Corporation,
Appellant,
vs.
Francis G. Caffey United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York and Richard J. McElligott, Acting 2nd Deputy Collector of Internal Revenue of the Third

603

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Monday, January 5th, 1920. continued

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds
Mr. Justice Day
Mr. Justice Van Devanter
Mr. Justice Clarke.

118

192

Morgenthaler Linotype Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Samuel W. Davis and H. B. Hays.

In error to the Springfield Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Springfield Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by

nday, January 5th 1920, continued.)

this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Southern Pacific Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
(Petitioner),
vs.
Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California and Mary E. Butler (sued also as Mary Butler) a minor, by Mary E. Butler, his Guardian ad litem.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of

Monday, January 5th 1920, contin

Per Mr. Justice McK

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Clarke.

William D. Hays
Appellant,
70 vs.
Port of Seattle, The
State of Washington
et al.

This cause came on to be hea
on the transcript of the record fro
District Court of the United Stat
the Western District of Washington
was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It
now here ordered, adjudged and de
by this Court that the decree of the
District Court in this cause be, and
same is hereby affirmed with cost

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

William Schall, Jr.,
Carl Muller, Edmund
Pavenstedt, and Frederick
Muller-Schall,
Petitioners
84 vs.
Frederick Cramer et al.,
Trustees of the Bankrupt

Monday, January 5th 1920, Continued

Estates of Albert Lemon, Bankrupt. and of Edward E. Carriere, Bankrupt.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

29 The United States, Petitioner, vs. William B. Poland and Frederick William Low.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth

Monday January 5th 1920, continue

This cause came on to be heard o
the transcript of the record from the
United States Circuit Court of Ap
for the Ninth Circuit and was
argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is
now here ordered, adjudged and de
creed by this Court that the decree
the said United States Circuit Co
of Appeals, in this cause, be, and
the same is hereby reversed; and
that this cause be, and the same
is hereby remanded to the District
Court of the United States for the
District of Alaska, Division No.
for further proceedings in conform
with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Dev

Producers Transportation
Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
219 The Railroad Commission
of the State of California
et al.

In error
the Sup
Court o
the Sta
of Calif
nia).

This cause came on to be heard o
the transcript of the record from the
Supreme Court of the State of Cali
fornia and was argued by coun

Monday, January 5th, 1920, (continued.)

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice VanDevanter.

51

City of Winchester et al., Appellants, vs. Winchester Water Works Company. } A.D. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court, that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Company, Appellant,

vs.

The United States.

71

Appeal f
The Court
Claims

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is hereby ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error,

vs.

458 Standard Brewery, Incorporated.

In error t
the Distric
Court of
United
States fo
the Distric
of Maryla

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Maryland, and

(Monday, January 5th 1920, continued.)

was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

474 The United States (Plaintiff in Error), vs. The American Brewing Company. (In error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

George J. Dooley Executor of John Dooley deceased (Plaintiff in Error)

Monday, January 5th 1920, contin

E. J. Horan, Commissioner of the Revenues, et al.

vs.

The State of Virginia.

In error to the Supreme Court of Appeals

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of State of Virginia and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof; It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.)

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Virt K. Winton, Administrator &c., et al

Appellants.

15

vs.

Jack Amos and others Known as the Mississippi Choctaws;

J. S. Bounds, Attorney in fact for P. Bounds,

Appellants.

16.

vs.

Jack Amos and others Known as the

Monday, January 5th 1920, continued.

Mississippi Choctaws;

17 John London, Appellant,
vs.
Jack Amos and others known as the Mississippi Choctaws;

18 Walter S. Field et al, Appellants,
vs.
Jack Amos and others known as the Mississippi Choctaws;

19 J. J. Beckham, Appellant,
vs.
Jack Amos and others known as the Mississippi Choctaws;

20 William N. Vernon, Appellant,
vs.
Jack Amos and others known as the Mississippi Choctaws;
and

21 Katie A. Howe, Executrix, etc., Appellant,
vs.
Jack Amos and others known as the Mississippi Choctaws.

It is ordered by the Court that these cases be restored to the docket for reargument.

80 A. Turner et al., Executors, &c.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
J. P. Wade, Sheriff of Brooks County, Georgia

Writ of
by the
That the
cause
stood
docket
reargum

625 Lillian B. Pemberton,
Petitioner
vs.
Illinois Commercial Men's Association.

Illinois.

On Petit
for writ
certiora
the Sup
Court of
State of

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as to such part of as against the pauper, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice W

604 Carlos L. Byron,
Petitioner
vs.
The United States of America

Monday, January 5th 1920, continued.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

626 The Baltimore Dry Docks and Ship Building Company, Petitioners, vs. New York and Porto Rico Steamship Company, Owner and Claimant of the Steamship "Isabella" and the United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

for a writ of certiorari herein to
United States Circuit Court of A
Peals for the Fourth Circuit and
the argument of counsel thereu
had, as well in support of ap
against the same it is now h
ordered by this Court that the pe
tition be, and the same is her
denied

Per Mr. Chief Justice W

—Order—

It is ordered by the Court th
the bond presented by the Mars
this day be approved and record

Per Mr. Chief Justice W

Which said bond is in the word
and figures following, viz:—

"Supreme Court of the United States

Know all men by these Pres
That Mark K. Green, of Washin
ton District of Columbia as Princ
and The Fidelity and Casualty Com
pany of New York, as Surety are he
and firmly bound unto The United
States of America in The Penal S
of Twenty Thousand ($20,000

Dollars, lawful money of the United States, to be paid to the said United States, or their certain attorney which payment well & truly to be made, we bind ourselves, our and each of our heirs, executors, administrators and assigns, jointly and severally, firmly by these presents.

Sealed with our seals and dated this fifth day of January, 1920.

Whereas, The above bounden Frank K. Green hath been appointed Marshal of the Supreme Court of the United States:

Now, Therefore, the condition of the above obligation is such that if the said Frank K. Green shall faithfully discharge the duties of his said office, and shall well and faithfully keep, disburse, pay over and account for according to law, the moneys that may come into his hands as such Marshal aforesaid then this obligation to be void, otherwise to remain in full force and virtue in law

Frank K. Green (seal)

Company of New York.
By Edgar K. Legg, Jr.,
Attorney in fact.

(Seal)

Witnesses:
John G. Urquhart
H.C. Davis.

The within and foregoing bond is hereby approved as to form the sufficiency of the amount thereof and the sufficiency of the surety thereon.

Edward D. White,
Chief Justice
of the United States.

The rate of premium charged for this bond is $2.00 a thousand: Total premium charged, $40.00

Edgar K. Legg, Jr.,
Attorney.

Forty cents Internal Revenue Stamps cancelled.

Charles E. Smith,
Appellant,
vs.
Kansas City Title

593

Monday, January 5th 1920, continued.

Pruet Company, et al. — On motion of Mr. Solicitor General King for the United States, leave is granted him to file brief as amicus curiae in this cause.

Ex Parte In the Matter of Walter Peterson, as Receiver &c. Petitioner. — The motion for leave to file petition for writ of prohibition or writ of mandamus was submitted to the consideration of the Court, by Mr. A. J. Rose, for the Petitioner.

Edgar C. Caldwell, Appellant, vs. W. E. Parker, Sheriff &c. — The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benjamin Micou for the Appellee.

Coleman J. Wards, et al, Petitioners vs. The Board of County

Love County, Okla-
homa.

The motion
dismiss in
cause was
mitted to the consideration of the Coun
Mr. Clinton A. Galbraith, and Mr. S
Rice for the respondent and by Mr
George B. Rittenhouse and Mr. P. D.
Vaj as amicus curiae in support
motion and by Mr. John Emerson
Bennett and Mr. George P. Glaz
the petitioner in opposition thereto.

654

Walter Evans,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
J. Rogers Gore, deputy
acting collector of
Internal Revenue.

The mo
to dismi
this cau
was sub-
mitted to
consideratio
of the Court by Mr. (X) Hauk Stage
man in behalf of Mrs. William
Marshall Bullitt for the Plaint
in error.

239.

W. H. Harris,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The State of Kansas.

The motion
to dismiss
this cause
was sub-
mitted to th
consideratio
of the Court by Mr. Richard L. Pos

Monday, January 5th 1920 (continued.)

for the defendant in error in support of the motion and by Mr. Joseph G. Waters for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Fort Smith Lumber Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
394 vs
The State of Arkansas ex rel; John D. Arbuckle, Attorney General.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. M. Steel and Mr. Henry L. Ditzhugh for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. John D. Arbuckle and Mr. George Vaughn for the defendant in error.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. J. M. Steel and Mr. Henry L. Ditzhugh for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition and by Mr. John D. Arbuckle and Mr. George Vaughn for the defendant in error in opposition thereto.

Hurni Packing Company,
Petitioner

Mutual Life Insurance Company of New York.

(Petition for a writ of certiorari was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Nelson S. Shull for the petitioner and by Mr. Frederick L. Allen, Mr. Frederic H. McKinney for the respondent.)

619. The Norma Mining Company, Petitioner, vs. Hugh Mackay.

(Petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George A. Williams for the petitioner and by Mr. [illegible] for the respondent.)

623 Wade O. Kelmer, Trustee, &c., Petitioner, vs. The First Savings and Banking Company.

(Petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Conrad N. Syme, and Mr. H. H. Stebbins for the petitioner and Mr. Clarence E. Martin for [illegible]

Monday, January 5th, 1920, continued:

Virginia Western
Power Company,
Petitioner,
629 vs.
The Commonwealth
of Virginia ex rel
The City of Clifton
Forge;

Virginia Western
Power Company,
Petitioner,
630 vs.
The Commonwealth
of Virginia at the
relation of The City
of Buena Vista;

Virginia Western
Power Company,
Petitioner,
631 vs.
The Commonwealth
of Virginia at the
relation of the Town
of Covington;
and
Virginia Western
Power Company,
Petitioner,
632

(The Commonwealth of Virginia) at the relation of the Town of Lexington.

(The Petit writs of orari was subm to the con

tion of the Court by Mr. A. M. K Mr. J. M. Perry for the Petit and by Mr. O. B. Harvey for the Respondent in No. 629, and by Mr. William A. Anderson, Mr. Frank and Mr. C. O. Jackson for the Re dent in No. 632.

635

Erie Railroad Com. Pamp. Petitioner

vs.

James B. Connors.

(The Petit for a wr certiora herein submitte the conse

tion of the Court by Mr. C. H. Stin Mr. Paul J. Jones for the Petit and by Mr. W. J. Keneally for Respondent.

637

Edwards Ferris Lumber Company, Petitioner

vs.

Quincan Car and Foun- dry Company.

(The Petit for writ certiora herein submitte the conse tion of

Court by Mr. Jacob Newman, Mr. Conrad N. Poehlenhusen, Mr. Henry L. Stern and Mr. Edward R. Johnston for the petitioners and by Mr. William D. McKenzie for the respondent.

639. Emil Herman, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. E. S. Wood for the petitioner and by Mr. Robert P. Stewart and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

641 and 642. Consolidated Window Glass Company, Petitioner vs. Window Glass Machine Company et al;

643 and 644. Pennsylvania Window Glass Company, Petitioner vs. Window Glass Machine Company et al; and Kane Glass Company, Petitioner

645 and 646.

Monday, January 5th, 1920, continued.

Window Glass Machine Company et al.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Marshall A. Christy and Mr. Charles Neave for the petitioners and by Mr. George H. Parmelee, Mr. Clarence P. Byrnes, and Mr. Livingston Gifford for the respondents.

Arctic Iron Company, Petitioner
vs.
Cleveland-Cliffs Iron Company, et al.

648

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Otto C. Sommerich and Mr. Edwin M. Borchard for the petitioners and by Mr. A. C. Denison, Mr. Horace Andrews and Mr. W. P. Belden for the respondents.

Great Northern Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The State of Washington.

64

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

Monday, January 5th 1920, continued.)

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

148 Magma Copper Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Charles Rissala. In error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Arizona.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, January 5th, 1920, contin

567 The United States of America Plaintiff in Error, vs. Q. Schrader's Son, Inc.

On mo of Mr Top Gen King fo Plaintiff error ordered

this cause be passed pursuan the 26th Rule.

591 Matty McLaughlin Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America.

This cau was pu to the co tion of Th Court by Counsel f

for the Plaintiff in Error and by Solicitor General King and Mr. Myers for the defendant in Erro

No - Orig'l 75 William Hulme, Complainant, vs. The State of New Jersey et al.

This ca was arg by Mr. E V. Abbott the com aut by

Thomas F. McGrath for the State New Jersey and by Mr. Solicito General King for remaining defe

Monday, January 5th 1920, continued.

O. O. Askren Attorney General &c., et al.,
Appellants,

521 vs.

The Continental Oil Company;

O. O. Askren, Attorney General &c, et al.
Appellants,

522 vs

Sinclair Refining Company; and

O. O. Askren Attorney General &c., et al.,
Appellants,

523 vs.

The Texas Company.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. A. B. Renehan for the appellants.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, January 6th, 1920

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened. 521

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ernest Wilkinson it is ordered that Myron L. Lesser, Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn according by. 522

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter B. Howe, it is ordered that Theodore Kiendl, Jr., Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as 523

esday, January 6th, 1920, continued

attorney and counsellor of this Court
and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the
Court in this behalf by Mr. William
L. Coombs, it is ordered that Francis
Braudon Moriarty, Esquire, of
Washington, District of Columbia
be admitted to practice as an
attorney and counsellor of this Court
and he was sworn accordingly.

C. W. Askren, Attorney
General, &c., et al.,
Appellants,
vs.
The Continental Oil
Company;

C. W. Askren, Attorney
General, &c., et al.,
Appellants,
vs.
Sinclair Refining Co.;
and
C. W. Askren, Attorney
General &c., et al.
Appellants,
vs.
The Texas Company.

The argument
of these cases
was continued
by Mr.
Charles R.
Brock, for
the appellees
and concluded
by Mr. E. R.
Wright for
the appellees.

Tuesday, January 6th, 1920, cont

386 Brooks-Scanlon Company, Petitioner, vs. Railroad Commission of Louisiana, the respondents.

This cause was argued by J. Blanc [illegible] for the petitioner by Mr. Wy[illegible] Mr. Barrow

540 Roberto Gayon Appellant and Plaintiff in error, vs. Thomas O. McCarthy, U.S. Marshal &c,

This cause was argued by William [illegible] Bennett for the appellant and plaintiff in error [illegible]

by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart for the appellee and defendant in error.

593 Charles E. Smith, Appellant, vs. Kansas City Title and Trust Co., et al.

Six hours was allowed for the argument of this cause on motion of Mr. Charles E. Sm[illegible]

for the appellee. Argument commenced by Mr. William Marshall Bullitt for the appellant.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'cl[illegible]

Wednesday, January 7th 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment this Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James H. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opinion.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George W. Wickersham it is ordered that Philip A. Walter, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Hagerman, it is ordered that William M. Matthews, Esquire, of Kansas City

(practice) as an attorney and co
sellor of this Court and his was a
accordingly.

On motion first made to the
on this behalf by Mr. H. S. Kenny o
it is ordered that John R. Howar
Esquire, of Des Moines, State of
be admitted to practice as an a
and counsellor of this Court, and
was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to th
Court in this behalf by Mr. Rob
S. Hume, it is ordered that Nie
Forman Starker, Esquire, of Vin
State of Iowa, be admitted to p
tice as an attorney and counsell
of this Court, and he was sworn
accordingly.

On motion first made to the
Court in this behalf by Mr. E. A.
Gongwer, it is ordered that Thomas
Brumhall, Esquire, of Washing to
District of Columbia be admitted
practice as an attorney and couns
of this Court, and he was sworn
accordingly.

Wednesday, January 7th, 1920, continued.

593 Charles E. Smith, Appellant, vs. Kansas City Title & Trust Company et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. William Marshall Bullitt for the appellant, by Mr. Charles E. Hughes, for the Federal Land Bank of Wichita, Kansas; by Mr. George H. Wickersham for the First Joint Land Bank of Chicago, and by Mr. Frank Hagerman for the appellant.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Thursday, January 8th 1920

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward H. White, Chief Justice
Joseph R. McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James H. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion duly made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank H. Scott, it is ordered that Fred N. Waggener, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion duly made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Nelson A. Loomis it is ordered that R. V. Blair, Esquire, and J. B. Lapsley, Esquire, of Topeka, State of Kansas, be admitted to

593

348

Tuesday January 8th 1920, continued.

practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. A. Elston, it is ordered that Samuel Poorman, Jr., Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Charles E. Smith, Appellant, vs. Kansas City Title & Trust Company et al.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Frank Hagerman for the appellant.

Erie Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. William M. Collins

This cause was argued by Mr. John M. Ryan, for the petitioner and by Mr. Hamilton Ward for the respondent.

Erie Railroad Company,

Thursday, January 8th 1920, co

355 vs. Antoni Szary.

This cause
argued by
Theodore Ru
Jr., for the Petitioner and by Mr.
C. Robinson for the respondent.

North Brothers Company,

Petitioner,

525 vs.

Ephraim Lederer, Collector &c.; and Forged Steel Stud Company,

Petitioner,

526 vs.

C. E. Lewellyn, Collector &c.

On mot
of Mr.
Luther
three hou
were all
each sid
the oral
ment of
cases. T
argumen
was comm
by Mr. E
B. Gordon
the Petit

in No. 526, continued by Mr. A. Winterstein for the Petitioner in
525, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Pierson for the respondent

Proclamation being made, the Court
adjourned until tomorrow at twelve
o'clock.

Friday, January 9th 1920—

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened—

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edmund Burnbaugh, it is ordered that Franklin Rubrecht, Esquire, and Donald M. Hamilton, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly—

On motion first made to the

Friday January 9th 1920, continued

M. Shurtz, it is ordered that Le
G. Shurtz Esquire) of Erie) State
Pennsylvania) be admitted to p
tice as an attorney and counsellor
this Court and he was sworn a
cordingly.

On motion duly made to the
Court in this behalf by Mr. Gu
P. Ritter, it is ordered that Bert
Russell, Esquire), of New York City
be admitted to practice as an
attorney and counsellor of this Cou
and he was sworn accordingly

William N. Graufla,
Petitioner,

130

vs.

The United States
of America

On petition
for writ of
certiorari
to the United
States Circ
Court of A
Deals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause having been called
regular order, and Mr. Assistant
Attorney General Harrison, of counse
for the respondent, having moved
the Court to dismiss the petition f
want of prosecution.

It is now here ordered by the
Court that the petition for a writ

Friday, January 9th, 1920, continued.

certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of prosecution.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

131. Robert H. Duncan, Petitioner vs. The United States of America. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause having been called in regular order, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Frierson, of counsel for the respondent having moved the Court to dismiss the petition for want of prosecution,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of prosecution.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

North Brothers Company, Petitioner,
vs.
Ephraim Lederer, Collector &c.;
and
Forged Steel Wheel Company, Petitioner
vs
C. E. Lewellyn, Collector &c.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Pierson for the respondents and concluded by Mr. George Sutherland for the petitioner in No. 526.

525

526.

Matthew P. Chapman, et al., Petitioners
vs.
John A. Wintroath.

This cause was argued by Mr. John A. Jackson for the petitioner and by Mr. Paul Synnestvedt for the respondent.

117

Joseph E. Madeau et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Union Pacific Railroad Company.

119

The argument of this cause

Friday, January 9th 1920, continued.

Crane for the Plaintiffs in error (Red) continued by Mr. R. W. Blair for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until monday next at twelve o'clock.

Monday, January 12th 1920 —

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol —

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph R. McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened —

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. D. A. Pike, it is ordered that William Lemke, Esquire of Fargo, State of North Dakota be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William R.

Monday, January 12th 1920, continued.

Hill, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles St. Bates, it is ordered that Jesse Andrews, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harold C. Smith, it is ordered that Joseph B. Newlin, Esquire of Winchester, State of Virginia, and Bernard Guy Smith, Esquire, of Montgomery, State of Alabama be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John C. Gittings it is ordered that Harold G. Aron, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an

Monday January 12th 1920 contin

and he was sworn according ly.

On motion first made to the
Court in this behalf by Mr. St
VanDyke, it is ordered that Ge
Noyes Slayton, Esquire of Newp
City, be admitted to practice as
attorney and counsellor of this Cou
and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the
Court in this behalf by Mr. Geor
King, it is ordered that M. Ste
Heidrick, Esquire of Washington, D
trict of Columbia) be admitted
practice as an attorney and coun
of this Court, and he was sworn
accordingly.

On motion first made to the
in this behalf by Mr. Harry Pey
it is ordered that T. J. Wills, Esq
of Raleigh) State of Mississippi, be
admitted to practice as an attor
and counsellor of this Court and h
was sworn accordingly.

Maryland Casualty
Company

vs

O. K. Leblanc.

73

Monday, January 12th 1920, continued.

The United States. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be modified as indicated in the opinion of this Court and, as so modified be, and the same is hereby affirmed, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Court of Claims for proceedings in accordance with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

The Eastern Extension, Australasia and China Telegraph Company, Limited, Appellant, vs. The United States. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

357

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

now here ordered and adjudged
this Court that the judgment o
said Court of Claims, in this c
be, and the same is hereby affir
Per Mr. Justice Clarke

The Birge-Forbes Company, Petitioner, vs. Carl R. Keyes) On writ of c
to the United
States Circ
Court of Ap
for the Fifth
Circuit.

76

This cause came on to be heard
the transcript of the record from
United States Circuit Court of A
for the Fifth Circuit, and was ar
by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It
now here ordered and adjudged
this Court that the judgment o
said United States Circuit Co
of Appeals, in this cause, be,
the same is hereby affirmed
costs; and that this cause be, an
the same is hereby remanded
the District Court of the United S
for the Eastern District of Texa
Per Mr. Justice Holmes

Monday, January 12th 1920, continued.

Northern Pacific Railway Company, Appellant
vs.
The United States.
109 } Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Concurring:
Mr. Justice Pitney
Mr. Justice McKenna.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Day
Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

Monday, January 12, 1920 continued.

132 Seaboard Air Line Railway, Appellant, vs. The United States. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be and the same is hereby affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Concurring:
Mr. Justice Pitney
Mr. Justice McKenna.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Clark
Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

Monday, January 12th 1920, continued

New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Company, Appellant, vs. The United States

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

133

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Concurring:
Mr. Justice Pitney
Mr. Justice McKenna.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Day
Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

Monday, January 12th 1920 continued.

Kansas City, Mexico & Orient Railway Company of Texas, Appellant,
vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

232

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Concurring:
Mr. Justice Pitney
Mr. Justice McKenna

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Clark
Mr. Justice Van Devanter

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

83

(Monday, January 12th 1920, continued)

William H. Ruhne, Complainant,
vs.
The State of New Jersey.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file the bill of complaint herein and of the return to the rule to show cause issued herein and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the rule to show cause be discharged and that the motion for leave to file the bill of complaint be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Western Union Telegraph Company, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Peter Boegli.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the

be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court, for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

239. W. W. Harris, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Kansas. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas and was argued by counsel. (on motion to dismiss or affirm)

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

591 Matty McLaughlin, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States. In error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio.

Monday, January 12th, 1920 (continued)

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ohio Valley Water
Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
128 vs.
Ben Avon Borough
and others.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be restored to the docket for reargument. The attention of counsel is directed to the question of whether under the state law the right to review the action of the Commission was limited by the State statutes to the particular remedy which was here resorted to, or whether such statutes left open the right to invoke

suit for the purpose of redressing wrongs deemed to have resulted from action taken by the Commission.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

No. 1, Orig. Ex parte, in the matter of Walter Peterson, as Receiver of the Interstate Coal Company, Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for writ of prohibition and/or a writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

No. 2, Orig. Ex parte, in the matter of Walter Peterson, as Receiver of the Interstate Coal Company, Petitioner.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of prohibition and/or a writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by the Court that cause be shown by the Honorable Augustus N. Hand, one of the United States District Judges for the Southern District of New York,

Monday, January 12th, 1920, continued.)

who may be at the time holding a trial term of the United States District Court in said district, before this Court, at the City of Washington on Monday, March 1st, 1920, or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard, why the prayer of said petition should not be granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Edgar C. Caldwell,
Appellant,
vs.
636 W. E. Parker, Sheriff of Calhoun County, Alabama.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 1st next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Walter Evans,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
654 J. Rogers Gore, Deputy and Acting Collector

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned argument on Monday, March next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice

Coleman J. Ward et al, Petitioners
vs.
224 The Board of County Commissioners of Love County, Oklahoma.

It is ordered by the Court that the motion to advance this cause be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice

Postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice

Hunni Packing Company, Petitioner,
608 vs.
Mutual Life Insurance Company of New York,

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

Denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice

Monday, January 12th 1920, continued.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is hereby, Denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Norma Mining Company, Petitioner, vs. Hugh Mackup, } On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

619

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Wade C. Kilmer,
Trustee in Bankruptcy
for the Adamantine
Clay Products Com-
pany, Bankrupt,
Petitioner,
623 vs.
The First Savings &
Banking Company.

On consideration of the petition
for a writ of certiorari herein to the
United States Circuit Court of Ap
for the Fourth Circuit, and of the
argument of counsel thereupon fo
as well in support of as against
same, it is now here ordered by the
Court that the said petition be, an
the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice W

Virginia-Western
Power Company,
Petitioner,
629 vs.
The Commonwealth
of Virginia at the
relation of the City
of Clifton Forge.

On consideration of the petition
writ of certio
to the Supre
Court of Ap
peals of the
State of Vir
ginia.

Monday, January 12th 1920, continued.)

for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

630 Virginia Western Power Company, Petitioner, vs. The Commonwealth of Virginia at the relation of the City of Buena Vista.

On petition for writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Virginia-Western Power Company, (Petitioner,
631 vs.
The Commonwealth of Virginia at the relation of the Town of Covington.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had and well in support of as against the same) it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Virginia-Western Power Company, Petitioner,
632 vs.
The Commonwealth of Virginia at the relation of the Town of Lexington.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia

Monday, January 12th, 1920, (continued.)

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

635 Erie Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. James B. Connors, Sixth Circuit.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

637 Edward Hines Lumber Company, Petitioner, vs. American Car and Foundry Company. Seventh Circuit.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

639 Emil Herman, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. Circuit.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

Monday, January 12th, 1920, continued.

of the argument of counsel therein, had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court, that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

641 Consolidated Window Glass Company, Petitioner, vs. Window Glass Machine Company and American Window Glass Company. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and of the argument of counsel therein, had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, January 12th, 1920, continu

Consolidated
Window Glass
Company,
Petitioner,
vs
Window Glass Machine
Company and American
Window Glass Com-
pany.

No 42.

On petiti
for writ
certiorar
to the U
States C
cuit Co
of Appe
for the
Circuit.

On consideration of the petit
for a writ of certiorari herein to th
United States Circuit Court of A
Peals for the Third Circuit and o
the argument of counsel Therein ha
had, as well in support of as
against the same, it is now here
ordered by this Court, that the sai
petition be, and the same is here
denied.

Mr. Chief Justice White

Pennsylvania Window Glass
Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
Window Glass Machine
Company, and Ameri-
can Window Glass
Company.

No 43

On petiti
for writ
certiorar
to the Uni
States Ci
cuit Cou
of Appea
for the T
Circuit.

Monday, January 12th, 1920, continued.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

044 Pennsylvania Window Glass Company, Petitioner, vs. Window Glass Machine Company and American Window Glass Company. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby

6/5

Kanawha Glass Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
Window Glass Machine Company and American Window Glass Company.
Third Circuit.

On consideration of the ... for a writ of certiorari herein ... United States Circuit Court of ... Seals for the Third Circuit and ... the argument of counsel thereupon ... had as well in support of ... against the same), it is now hereby ordered by this Court that the ... petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice ...

6/16

Kanawha Glass Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
Window Glass Machine Company and American Window Glass Company.
Third Circuit.

On ... for a ... of cer... to the ... States ... cuit C... of A... for the ...

Monday, January 12th, 1920, continued.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

648 Arctic Iron Company, Petitioner vs. Cleveland-Cliffs Iron Company and William G. Mather.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby

The United States of America, as Trustee for Guardian of, and ex rel. Sam Williams, Plaintiff in Error,

235

vs.

Seufert Brothers Company, et al.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King, of counsel for the Plaintiff in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

John M. Scott et al., Appellants,

508

vs.

Lynn J. Frazier et al.

The motion to advance their cause submitted by the consideration of the

Court by Mr. A. A. Pike for the appellees, in support of the motion, and by Mr. N. C. Young for the

Monday, January 12th 1920, continued.

The Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Appellant, vs. The United States. 163

On motions of Mr. R. Carter Poppe in that behalf, leave is granted him to file brief as amicus curiae in this cause.

Morris & Cumings Dredging Company, Appellant, vs. Comus Steamboat Company. 663

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chauncey I. Clark and Mr. George Noyes Slayton for the petitioner and by Mr. J. Parker Kirlin and Mr. Robert S. Erskine for the respondent.

Ex parte: In the Matter of James R. Bishop, Administrator, &c., Petitioner. Orig'l

The motions for leave to file petition for a writ of prohibition or mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. S. Dyer, in behalf

El Banco Popular de Economias y Prestamos de San Juan, P. R.
Appellant,
342 vs.
Elias B. Wilcox.

ages and Mr. Ben A. Matthews for
Appellee in support of the motion
by Mr. Boyd B. Jones, for the
thereto.

The motion
dismiss
this cause
was subm
to the consi
test of the
Court by
Jose R. S

W. D. Hallowell,
Petitioner
600 vs.
The United States
of America.

by Mr. William P. Richardson for
the Petitioner, and by Mr. Robert
Stewart and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely
for the respondent.

The petition
a writ of cer
orari herein
was submitt
to the consid
tion of the C

Yee Hon,
Petitioner
634 vs.
Edward White,
Commissioner
of Immigration
&

The petition
a writ of cer
orari herein w
submitted to th
consideration
the Court by

Monday, January 12th 1920, continued.

and Mr. M. Walton Hendrey for the petitioner.

660 The American Guaranty Company, petitioner, vs. American Fidelity Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Smith E. Westfall, and Mr. Hugh M. Bennett for the petitioner and by Mr. N.B. Arnold for the respondent.

135 Joseph Gordon, plaintiff in Error, vs. The People of the State of Illinois.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is therefore in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the

Monday, January 12th, 1920, continued

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

114. Joseph E. Nadeau et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Union Pacific Railroad Company.

This argument of this cause was continued by Mr. R. H. Blair and Mr. N. H. Loomis for the defendant in error and concluded by Mr. A. E. Crane for the plaintiffs in Error.

Orig'l. The State of Rhode Island, Complainant, vs. A. Mitchell Palmer, Attorney General of the United States et al.

This cause was argued on the motion for leave to file bill of complaint by Mr. Herbert A. Rice for the complainant and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Pierson and Mr. Solicitor General King for the defendants.

535 Carbon Steel Company, Petitioner, vs.

Monday, January 12th 1920, continued.

C.E. Jewellyn, Collector, etc. This cause was argued by Mr. N.V. Baxter for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Denison for the respondent.

National Lead Company, Appellant, vs. The United States. for the appellant. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Alex. and Mr. Britton.

123

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at Twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, January 13th, 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment this Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James M. Ryan, it is ordered that Frederick Clayton Peterson, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl A. Mapes it is ordered that

day, January 13th 1920, continued.

K. Acker, Esquire, of Washington District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

George Quay Now, Petitioner, vs. Edward H. White, as Commissioner of Immigration &c. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jackson M. Ralston for the petitioner and by Mr. Robert P. Stewart and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

George D. Archer et al., Appellants, vs. The United States. and The United States, Appellant, vs. George D. Archer et al. On motion of Mr. J. M. Miller, the death of George D. Archer was suggested, and the appearance of Kate C. Archer, as Administratrix of the

Tuesday, January 13th 1920, cont

as a Party, filed and entered
this cause.

(John C. Robinson
et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
146 vs.
The United States
of America on behalf
of and for use of
Brown-Ketcham
Iron Works et al.

This c
was
on m
of Mr
Hazen
in th
half.

National Lead Com-
pany,
Appellant,
123 vs.
The United States.

The ar
of this
was
tinued
Mr. A
audien

for the appellant by Mr. Assist
Attorney General Lewis for the
Appellee and concluded by Mr
Alexander Britton for the app

Great Northern Rail-
way Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
124 vs.
J. C. Cahill et al).
&c., et al).

This ca
was ar
by Mr
E. C. L
for the
Plaintiff
in erro

Tuesday, January 13th, 1920, (continued.)

and by Mr. Oliver E. Sweet for the defendants in error.

Kate C. Archer, Administratrix &c., et al., Appellants, vs. The United States; and The United States Appellant, vs. Kate C. Archer, Administratrix &c. et al. States!

These cases were argued by Mr. R. M. Miller and Mr. Percy Bell for Archer et al., and by Mr. Solicitor General King for the United

125 220

Mary A. Rex, Administratrix etc., Appellant, vs. The United States et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Harry Peyton for the appellant and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Harris for the appellee.

126

David Goldsmith, et al., Plaintiffs in Error,

127

Tuesday, January 13th 1920 continued.

George G. Reuder - The argument
gas Construction of this cause
Company. was commenced
by Mr. Hazid
Goldsmith for the Plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'Clock.

Wednesday, January 14th 1920, continued.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Gunn, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. C. Calhoun it is ordered that J. P. Dobson, Esquire, and William T. Fowler, Esquire of Frankfort State of Kentucky be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were severally sworn accordingly.

Kansas City Southern
Railway Company,

154 vs. The United States. On motion of Mr. Ben C leave is hereby granted him to file brief as amicus curiae in this cause.

The Grand Trunk Western Railway Company, Appellant,
153 vs.
The United States. to section 9 of Rule 2 &c.

Allowed Goldsmith et al's, Plaintiff in Error,
127 vs.
The George G Rowden-Post Construction Company.

(Rodgers for the Appellee and by Mr. Allard Goldsmith for the Plaintiffs in error.

On motion Mr. Assist Attorney Ge Stillacy is ordered this cause Passed Jus

The arguments of this cause was continued by Mr. Allard Goldsmith, for the Plaintiffs in error, by Mr. Nicholas and conclu

Henry Paincomb et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
110 vs.
City and County of

Wednesday January 14th 1920 continued

Denver et al. This cause was argued by Mr. P. J. Wilson-nell for the Plaintiff in Error and by Mr. James A. Marsh for the defendants in error.

The United States of America Plaintiff in Error,
134 vs.
The Chase National Bank

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stephens for the Plaintiff in error and continued by Mr. Henry Root Stern for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock

Thursday, January 15th 1920

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices
Paul K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Pierson, it is ordered that N. B. Rodman of Washington, District of Columbia, Esquire, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn according by

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James R. Mann, it is ordered that George L. Wire, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney

day, January 15th 1920, continued.)

and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hyman M. Nau it is ordered that William A. Rutland Esquire) of Boston, State of Massachusetts be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Dwyer it is ordered that Matthew A. Bishop, Esquire), of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph L. Cotter, ~~Esquire~~, it is ordered that Simon Rauh, Esquire, of New York City; William C. Morton, Esquire, of White Plains, State of New York, and Abraham Levitan, Esquire, of Jersey City, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and

Thursday, January 15th, 1920, contin

On motion first made to the
in this behalf by Mr. Frank P
it is ordered that Eldon Scott Lo
Esquire) of Albuquerque State
New Mexico be admitted to pra
as an attorney and counsellor of
Court and he was sworn acc
ingly.

On motion first made to the
in this behalf by Mr. B.F. Mat
it is ordered that Charles M. Sl
Esquire) of El Dorado State of K
was be admitted to practice as
attorney and counsellor of this
Court and he was sworn accord

On motion first made to the
in this behalf by Mr. Enoch A. Ch
it is ordered that Matthew S. H
er, Jr., Esquire), of Cleveland, O
of Ohio, be admitted to practice
an attorney and counsellor of the
Court, and he was sworn accordi

The United States of
America,
Plaintiff in Error,
134 vs.
The Chase National Bank.

The argume
of this ca
was contin
by Mr. Ne
Root Stim
The def

Thursday, January 15th 1920, continued.

in error and concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Spellacy for the Plaintiffs in Error.

136 E. Gouge et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. John M. Hart, collector of Internal Revenue.

This cause was argued by Mr. J. S. Ashworth for the appellants and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Pierson for the appellee.

137 E. B. Spiller, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Co.;

138 E. B. Spiller, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Chicago and Eastern Illinois Railroad Co.;

139 E. B. Spiller, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Chicago & Alton Railroad Company;

E. B. Spiller,
(Plaintiff in Error,)
1140 vs.
The Missouri Pacific
Railroad Co.;

E. B. Spiller,
(Plaintiff in Error,)
1141 vs.
St Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Co.;

E. B. Spiller,
(Plaintiff in Error,)
1142 vs.
St Louis & San Francisco Railroad Co.;

E. B. Spiller,
(Plaintiff in Error,)
1143 vs.
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co.;

E. B. Spiller,
(Plaintiff in Error,)
1144 vs.
Illinois Central Railroad Co.; and

Thursday, January 15th 1920, continued.

E. B. Miller,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Missouri Kansas & Texas Railway Co.
Plaintiff in Error

These causes were argued by Mr. Buckner & Mr. Heathcock for the and by Mr. W. J. Norton for the defendants in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Friday, January 16th 1920—

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorables Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James H. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. M. P. Kinkaid it is ordered that Frank M. Tyrrell, Esquire, of Lincoln, State of Nebraska be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. M. T. Shreve, it is ordered that

idayp January 16th 1920 continued.)

E.T. Kincaid, Esquire), of Court
State of Pennsylvania be ad-
mitted to practice as an attorney
and counsellor of this Court, and
he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the
Court in this behalf by Mr. Silden
P. Spencer, it is ordered that Robert
Burkham, Esquire), of St. Louis,
State of Missouri, be admitted
to practice as an attorney and
counsellor of this Court and he
was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the
Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert
Pillsbury it is ordered that
Clarence Alfred Bunker, Esquire)
of Boston State of Massachusetts
be admitted to practice as an
attorney of this Court.

On motion first made to the
Court in this behalf by Mr. E.
Bright Wilson, it is ordered that
James N. Rosenberg, Esquire), of
New York City be admitted to
practice as an attorney and
counsellor of this Court and he

Friday, January 16th 1920, continued

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom McKeown it is ordered that A. P. [illegible] Esquire, of Ardmore, State of Oklahoma be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

161 Jim Duey Moy,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. [illegible] Assistant Attorney General it is ordered that this cause be passed pursuant to the 26th Rule.

147 Panama Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Joseph P. Rodgers.

This cause was argued by Mr. William [illegible] MacGinty for the defendant in error and submitted by Mr. Frank Pierce and Mr. [illegible] P. Van Hamel for the plaintiff in error.

150 Bloss,
Petitioner,
vs.
Central of Georgia

Friday, January 16th 1920, (continued.)

Railway Company et al.,

This cause was argued by Mr. Alex. Lawrence for the petitioners and by Mr. H. H. Johnson, for the respondents.

Elizabeth Hall, Administratrix, &c.
Petitioner
vs.
The Philadelphia & Reading Railway Company.
Henry H. Keely, Jr., for the respondent.

151

This cause was argued by Mr. Charles H. Hagaman for the Petitioner and cued by Mr.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Monday, January 19th 1920

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Attorney General Palmer it is ordered that Ralph J. Baker, Esquire, of Harrisburg, State of Pennsylvania, and Henry D. Green, Esquire, of Ballston, State of Virginia be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the

nday, January 19th, 1920, (continued.)

Norton, it is ordered that Edward
N. Blocker, Esquire, of La Jolla,
State of California be admitted to
practice as our attorney and coun
ellor of this Court and he was
sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this
Court in this behalf by Mr. Solici-
or-General King, it is ordered that
William J. Mack, Esquire, of Chi-
ago, State of Illinois, and John
C. Buck, Jr., Esquire, of Wash-
ington District of Columbia be
admitted to practice as attorneys
nd counsellors of this Court and
ey were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this
ourt in this behalf by Mr. Gilbert
. Pillsbury it is ordered that
rthur P. French, Esquire, of
oston, State of Massachusetts be
dmitted to practice as an attorney
nd counsellor of this Court and
e was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to
e Court in this behalf by Mr.
obert G. Dodge it is ordered

Boston State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl E. Whitney it is ordered that Daniel Mc. Avery Esquire, of Newyork City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. King, it is ordered that Charles E. Lalanne, Esquire of Newyork City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. Dougal Keer, it is ordered that J. Raymond Piffard, Esquire, of Hoboken and Samuel Heyman Esquire of Jersey City, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

Monday, January 19th 1920, continued

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Munson, it is ordered that N. K. Sweetland, Esquire, and William F. DuBois, Esquire, of Coudersport, State of Pennsylvania, and Churchill Merchand, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Niels Juul, it is ordered that Herbert V. Juul, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, and Thomas M. O'Brien, Esquire, of the District of Columbia be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Robert R. Stroud,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States
of America.

On consideration of the Petition for a rehearing herein, It is now here

ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied

Monday, January 19th, 1920, continued.

Napa Valley Electric Company, Appellant,
vs.
The Railroad Commission of the State of California and Max Thelen, Alex. Gordon, M. D. Loveland, et al., as Members &c.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

1401.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna

Chipman, Limited, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The Thomas B. Jeffrey Company,

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

516

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

E. Gouge et al. Same, and Martha Gouge, Appellants, vs. John M. Nash, Collector of Internal Revenue, W. N. Osborn, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and S. J. Copenhaver.

136

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Virginia and was argued by counsel.

now here) ordered, adjudged and
creed by this Court that this ap
in this cause, be, and the same is
hereby dismissed) for the want o
jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

The State of Rhode
Island,
Complainant,
- Orig'l
vs.
A. Mitchell Palmer,
Attorney General of the
United States, et al.

On consi
tion of th
motion f
leave to
the bill
complain
herein (
the return to the
and of this a

ment of counsel thereupon had,
It is now here ordered by th
Court that the motion for leave t
the bill of complaint be, and the
same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Ex Parte In the
matter of James H.
Bush, Administrator,
etc.,
Petitioner,
- Orig'l

On consi
tion of th
motion f
leave to
a petition
for a wri
of Mandamus or Prohibition or a writ of
herein.
It is now here ordered by the C

Monday, January 19th 1920, continued.

that the said motion be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

John W. Scott, William J. Howe, O.B. Severson et al., Appellants, vs. Lynn J. Frazier et al. 508

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 12th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

George R. Broadwell, Petitioner vs. The Board of County Commissioners of Carter County, Oklahoma 289

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause be, and the same is hereby postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

El Banco Popular de Economias y Prestamos de San Juan, P. R.,
Appellant,
vs.
Elias B. Wilcox.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause be, and the same is hereby postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

314

The Kansas City Southern Railway Company and The Texarkana and Ft. Smith Railway Company,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Road Improvement District No. 6 of Little River County, Arkansas.

620

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the said petition be, and the same is hereby postponed until the hearing of this cause on the writ

nday, January 19th, 1920, continued:

of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Yee Ah Ou
Petitioner,
vs.
Edward White,
as Commissioner
of Immigration of
Port of San Francisco.

On Petitions for
writ of certiorari
to the United
States Circuit
Court of Appeals for the
Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the Petition
for a writ of certiorari herein to the
United States Circuit Court of Ap-
peals for the Ninth Circuit, and of
the argument of counsel in support
of the same, it is now here ordered by
this Court that the said Petition be
and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

W. R. Wallowell,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States
of America

On Petition for
writ of certiorari
to the United
States Circuit
Court of Appeals
for the Ninth
Circuit.

On consideration of the Petition

United States Circuit Court of
for the Ninth Circuit, and of
argument of counsel thereupon
as well in support of as against
the same, it is now here ordered
by this Court, that the said petit
ber, and the same is hereby d

Per Mr. Chief Justice W

660

The American Guaranty Company, Petitioner, vs. American Fidelity Company. Sixth Circuit.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice

Monday, January 19th, 1920, continued.

663 Morris and Cummings Dredging Company, Petitioner vs. Cornell Steamboat Company. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel therein had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

664 Jeong Quey Now, Petitioner vs. Edward White, as Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of San Francisco. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the
for a writ of certiorari herein to
United States Circuit Court o
Appeals for the Ninth Circuit
of the argument of counsel thereupon
had as well in support of as ag
the same, it is now hereupon ordered by
Court, That the said petition be, a
the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Wh

—Order—

It is ordered by the Court that
cases heretofore placed on the Sum
docket, viz: Nos. 281 and 415 be
for Monday, March 1st next at
head of the call for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice

The State of Rhode Island, Complainant,
29 Orig. 'e' vs.
A. Mitchell Palmer, Attorney General, et al.

The issue
of proce
was wa
and ap
ance ent
for the
defendants

motion of Mr. Solicitor General it
is that behalf.

Monday, January 19th, 1920, continued.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error,
444 vs.
Everett L. Simpson.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the Plaintiff (in) error.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner,
492 vs.
Anderson Gratz et al, &c.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the Petitioner.

J. Hartley Manners, Petitioner,
370 vs.
Oliver Morosco.

The joint motion to place this cause on the Summary Docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr Alexander Ewing in behalf of Mr. Dwight Geber and Mr. W. M. J. Hughes for the Petitioner by Mr Charles Tuttle for the respondent and Mr. Nathan Burkan for respondent's

582 and 607

George S. Hawkes,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Harvey C. Smith, Secretary of State of Ohio.

The joint
tion to a
This cause
submitte
the consi
tion of t

Court by Mr. Arthur Kelton, and
George S. Hawkes for the Plaintiff
error and by Mr. Lawrence Maxw
for the defendant in error.

128

Ohio Valley Water Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Ben Avon Borough et al.

The joint
tion to set
causes for
hearing wa
submitted
The consid
tion of the

Court by Mr. John G. Buchanan,
George B Gordon and Mr. William M
Smith for the Plaintiff in error a
by Mr. David L. Starr Mr. Albert
Liddell, and Mr. L. K. Guiler, Mr. C
B. Dawson, and Mr. Berne St. Evan
for the defendants in error.

628

Chicago, Milwaukee & St Paul Railway Company,
Petitioner
vs.

McCaull-Dinsmore Company,

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. A. Field, Mr. O. W. Haynes and Mr. F. W. Root, for the petitioner.

The Western Union Telegraph Company,
Petitioner,
638 vs.
Eugene E. Southwick.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Rush Taggart and Mr. Francis Raymond Stark for the petitioner.

Atlanta Terminal Company,
Petitioner,
647 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Mark Bolding and Mr. Arthur Steyman, for the petitioner and by Mr. William L. Frierson for the respondent.

The Yazoo & Mississippi Valley Railroad Company et al.,
Petitioners,
655 vs.
Nichols & Company.

The Petition
a writ of
certiorar
herein
submitte
to the C
suberatu

the Court by Mr. Charles N. Burch,
A.D. Minor and Mr. Blewett Lee f
Petitioners and by Mr. John M. C
and Mr. Frederick S. Tyler for
respondent.

James G. Wilson,
Trustee, &c.,
Petitioner,
658 vs.
A. J. Benham
et al
Petitioner

The Petition
a writ of ce
tiorari here
was submi
to the Court
Mr. James
Wilson for

Marie Equis
Petitioner,
666 vs.
The United States
of America.

The Petition
a writ of ce
orari herein
was submitt
to the consid
tion of the
Court by Mr
James E. Pe
by Mr. Rob

E. E. Wood and Mr.
for the Petitioner and

Monday, January 19th 1920, continued.

P. Stewart and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

675 Edwin Reitz, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.

The petition for writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis H. Crofoot for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert P. Stewart and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, for the respondent.

165 P. S. Royster Guano Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Virginia Mountain Gas Company.

This cause was passed, pursuant to the twenty-sixth Rule of this Court.

176 V. & S. Bottle Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Mountain Gas Company.

On motion of Mr. Ralph J. Baker, leave is granted to file brief of Pennsylvania Electric Company as amicus curiae in this

26 Orig. | Ex Parte In the Matter of J. Raymond Tiffany as Receiver &c. Petitioner.

This cause was argued by Mr. Murr Lamb for the Petitioner.

by Mr. Samuel Heyman for the re

152 | Evansville Red Bowling Green Packet Company Plaintiff in Error, vs. M. M. Logan et al. &c.

This cause was arg by Mr. Hobson for Plaintiff error and Mr. Mill

Fowler for the defendant in error.

154 | Kansas City Southern Railway Company, Appellant vs. The United States.

This cause submitted the consid tion of the Court by Alexander Britton Es

Mr. Evans Browne for the appellee and by Mr. Assistant Attorney Gen Sellacy for the appellee and by Benjamin Carter as amicus curi

Monday, January 19th 1920, continued.

155 John L. Bates, receiver, &c., Appellant,
vs
Sumner Dresser, Administrator &c.;

On motion of Mr. Robert G. Dodge, four hours were allowed for the argument of these cases. Argument commenced by Mr. Frank W. Nay for Bates, receiver, &c.,

Sumner Dresser, Administrator &c., Appellant,
156 vs.
John L. Bates, Receiver, &c.;

John L. Bates, Receiver, &c., Appellant,
157 vs.
John M. Dean, Executor &c., et al.;
and
John L. Bates, Receiver, &c., Appellant,
158 vs.
Clarena Alfred Bunker et al., Administratore &c.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, January 20th 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment this Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert N. Harrell, it is ordered that Thomas Beckett, of Washington, District of Columbia; Thomas Jewell Price, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, and Peter A. Chapelle, of Sapulpa State of Oklahoma were admitted to practice.

170

155

156

Harmon P. McKnight
vs
The United States.

—Orig'l

day, January 20th 1920, continued.)

Per curiam: The prayer to be allowed to proceed in forma pauperis for the purpose of an application for certiorari to review the judgment below, as well as for the purpose of an appeal asked to review a refusal to release on habeas corpus, made to the Chief Justice and by him submitted to the Court for its action is hereby denied.

Louis St. Berlein, Appellant,
vs.
The United States.

This cause was passed pursuant to the 26th Rule, on motion of Mr. Assistant Attorney General Davis for the appellee.

John L. Bates, Receiver &c., Appellant,
vs.
Summer Dresser, Administrator &c.;

Summer Dresser, Administrator &c., Appellant,
vs.
John L. Bates, Receiver &c.,

Tuesday, January 20th 1920, contin

157 John L. Bates, Receiver &c., Appellant, vs. John M. Adams, Executor &c., et al., and John L. Bates, Receiver &c., Appellant, vs. Clarence Alfred Bunkley, et al, Administrators &c.

This ar
ment
These
was co
by Mr
N. May
Bates,
Mr. Rod
G. Hodg
Dresser
by Mr.
Alfred
Ker for

Ker and Hardy, &c.; by Mr. A. E. P
bury for Adams &c., et al.; and con
cluded by Mr. Hawk, M. May
Bates &c.

158 The Western Union Telegraph Company, Petitioner vs. George M. Brown, Executor, &c., et al.

The argumen
This cause
commenced
Mr. Bevor
L. Hodges
for the Pe

Proclamation being made, the Court
adjourned until tomorrow at twelve
o'clock.

Wednesday, January 21st 1920—

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Associate Justices

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Merrill Moores it is ordered that Oscar R. Luhring, Esquire, and Isidor Kahn, Esquire, of Evansville, State of Indiana be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel Doorman, Jr., it is ordered that William A.

of California be admitted to pra
as an attorney and counsellor
this Court, and he was sworn a
cordingly.

On motion first made to the Cou
this behalf by Mr. Alvin L. Newm
it is ordered that Thomas M. Be
Esquire, of Washington District
Columbia be admitted to practic
an attorney and counsellor of th
Court and he was sworn accord

On motion first made to the Cou
in this behalf by Mr. Walter Gord
Merritt it is ordered that Thom
Stowes, Esquire, of Farmington St
of Connecticut and Frank X. Sc
Esquire) of New York City be ad
mitted to practice as an attorn
and counsellors of this Court and
they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Cou
in this behalf by Mr. C. R. Pierc
it is ordered that John M. Sut
Esquire, of Avid State of New
York, be admitted to practice as
attorney and counsellor of this
Court, and he was sworn accord

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company, Petitioner
vs.
174 Mrs. Lessie Norton, Administratrix, &c.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the Petitioner to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Rederiaktiebolaget Atlanten, Petitioner,
vs.
171 Aktieselskabet Kabel Kom-og Rederetsk Kompagniet.

This cause was passed pursuant to the 26th Rule.

The Western Union Telegraph Company, Petitioner
vs.
159 George M. Brown

Wednesday, January 21st 1920, contin

The argument of this cause
continued by Mr. Beverly L. Hodg
for the Petitioners by Mr. Samuel
man Jr., for the respondents, and
cluded by Mr. Rush Taggart for th
Petitioners.

(Cornelia) A. Klumbar,
Plaintiff in Error,
160 vs.
The City of New York

in error and by Mr. William Herb
King for the defendant in error.

This cause
was argu
by Mr. Ha
G. Aron fo
the Plaint

Charles S. Henry, as
sole executor &c.,
Appellant,
162 vs.
The United States.

This cause
argued by
Mr. Simon
Lyon for
appellant
and by Mr
Solicitor General King for the appe

The Grand Trunk
Western Railway
Company,
Appellant,
153 vs.
The United States.

Wednesday, January 21st 1920, continued.)

(The Argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Thomas H. Halpin, for the appellant.)

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at twelve o'clock.

Thursday, January 22d 1920, continued

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices

Frank K. Gunn, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis C. Crampton, it is ordered that Clark C. Seely, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wells Goodykoontz it is ordered that Harry Schaw, Esquire, of Williamson, State of West Virginia be admitted to prac-

Thursday, January 22nd 1920, continued.

tice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General King it is ordered that E Randolph Preston, Esquire, of Charlotte, State of North Carolina be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Daniel Davenport, it is ordered that Murray P. Quigg, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Merrill Moores it is ordered that Andrew J. Hickey, Esquire, of LaPorte, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Thursday, January 22d 1920, contin

683 George Wallace et al., Appellants, vs. Walker D. Hines, Director General of Railroads et al.

The joint tion to ad this cause submitted the consid tion of the by Mr. C M. Bunn counsel for the appellees.

177. Atlantic Coast Electric Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Board of Public Utility Commissioners of the State of New Jersey, et al.

This c was d pursua to sec 9 of Ru 26.

153 The Grand Trunk Western Railway Company, Appellant, vs. The United States.

The argu of this c was con tinued b Mr. Thom D. Nal Jun for the a by Mr. A Pellant and concluded by Mr. A Pellant Attorney General for the appellee.

Thursday, January 22d 1920, continued.

163 The Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co. Appellant vs. The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. F. Carter Pope and Mr. Benjamin Carter for the appellant and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Davis for the appellee.

164 Duplex Printing Press Company, Appellant, vs. Emil J. Herring et al &c.

This cause was argued by Mr. Walter Gordon Merritt and Mr. Daniel Davenport for the appellant and by Mr. Frank X. Sullivan for the appellees.

567 The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. A. Schrader's Son, Inc.

The argument commenced by Mr. Henry S. Mitchell for the plaintiff in Error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Friday, January 23d 1920—

Pursuant to adjournment, this Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James H. Beller, it is ordered that Charles Lincoln McGuire, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he sworn accordingly.

189 The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
John S. Coffland.

367

167

Jan'y January 23d 1920, continued.—

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H.A. Hollinger with for the Plaintiff in Error and by Mr. Ernest Sidney McNamee for the defendant in error.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
W. Schrader's Son, Inc. (defendant in error and cross-plaintiff in error.)

This cause was argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Frank M. Owen and cross-argued by Mr. Solicitor General King for the plaintiff in error.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Thomas G. MacMillan et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. George H. Buckingham and Mr. Marquis Eaton for the defendants in error.

Friday, January 23d 1920, continue

Carter Glass, Secretary of the Treasury, et al.,
Appellants,
86 vs.
Lee Doris L. Ormes, Administratrix, etc.

This ca
was ar
by Mr.
Solicito
Genera
for the
appella
and by
appelle

Mary Poole for the appellees.

W. S. Bottle Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
176 vs.
Mountain Gas Co.

This cau
was arg
by Mr.
LaRue M
son and
W. K. Swe

for the Plaintiff in Error, and by Mr. Churchill Mehard for the defendant in error.

In the Estate of P. O. Beckwith, Inc.,
Petitioner
178 vs.
The Commissioner of Patents.

This cau
was arg
by Mr. J
G. Howar
for the P
titioner a
submitte
by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Davis, for the respondent.

Friday, January 23d 1920, (continued.)

180 Superior & Pittsburg Copper Com. Co. Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Steve Davidovich &c.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Olson for the Plaintiff in Error, and by Mr. Samuel Herrick for the defendant in error.

181 Gertrude Minnie Jones, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Max Kittscher.

This cause was argued by Mr. W. Martin Jones, Jr., for the Plaintiff in error, and submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward H. Pittmann and Mr. Charles T. Pittmann for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at twelve o'clock.

Monday January 26th 1920—

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. E. B. Cunningham, it is ordered that Robert M. Gibson, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General King, it is ordered that David S. Cook, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be and Howard Lewis, Esquire, of

ndays January 26th 1920, continued.

Toledo, State of Ohio be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert N. Miller, it is ordered that Charles H. Brady, Esquire, of Toledo, State of Ohio be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court; and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paul E. Lesh, it is ordered that John S. Powers, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lunsford L. Hammer, it is ordered that William C. Blatt, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. Otis Bland it is ordered that Jacob Lewis Moreuitz, Esquire, of Newport News, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, it is ordered that George H. Lowie, Esquire, of New York State be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

358

Mary A. Rex, Administratrix of the estate of James A. Ivie, deceased,

Appellant,

vs.

The United States and The Ute Indians.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

126

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by Counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is

ndaay, January 26th 1920, continued.

here ordered and adjudged by this Court
that the judgment of the said Court
of Claims, in this cause be, and the
same is hereby affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Silverthorne Lumbee
Company, Inc, and
Frederick W. Silverthorne,
Individually, and as
President of the Silver-
thorne Lumbee Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of
America.

In error to
the District
Court of
the United
States for
the Western
District of
New York.

This cause came on to be heard
the transcript of the record from
e District Court of the United States
r the Western District of New York, and
as argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is
w here ordered and adjudged by
is court that the judgment of the
id District Court in this cause be,
d the same is hereby reversed, and
t this cause be, and the same is
eby remanded to the said District
rt for further proceedings in con-

Monday, January 26th 1920 continued.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:
Mr. Chief Justice White.
Mr. Justice Pitney.

Evansville and Bowling Green Packet Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
152 vs.
M. M. Logan, J. A. Scott and R. T. Grant, constituting the Board of Valuation and Assessment of the State of Kentucky.

In error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

V. and S. Bottle Company,
Plaintiff in error,
176 vs.
Mountain Gas Company.

180

Monday, January 26th 1920, continued

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Superior and Pittsburgh Coal Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Steve Davidovich, Sometimes known as Steve Davis. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the judgment of the

Monday, January 26th, 1920, cont

said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affi with costs, and interest until p at the same rate per annum th similar judgments bear in the Courts of the State of Arizona.

Per Mr. Chief Justice

Gertrude Minnie Jones,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Max Hilscher.

181.

This cause came on to be he on the transcript of the record the Supreme Court of the State New Mexico, and was argued counsel.

On consideration whereof, i is now here ordered and adjud by this Court, that the writ of e in this cause, be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the wa of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Wh

The Baltimore)
Ohio Railroad
Company,
Plaintiff in Error,

Monday, January 26th, 1920, continued.

189. John S. Coffland. vs. In error to the Court of Appeals of the Seventh Appellate District of the State of Ohio, in and for Harrison County, Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the Seventh Appellate District of the State of Ohio in and for Harrison County, Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

444. The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Everett L. Simpson. On considera-tion of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Mon-

Monday, January 26th 1920, cont

-ferred to for was assigned for that da

(Per Mr. Chief Justice

582 aud. 69 | George S. Hawkes, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Nanney C. Smith, Secretary of State of Ohio.

On cons
tion of
motion to
vance th
cause, a
now her

ordered by the Court that said m
be, and the same is hereby, gra
and the cause assigned for arg
ment on Monday, March 1st ne
after the case heretofore assig
for that day.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioners, vs. Anderson Gratz et al., &c., et al.

492

On consid
of the mo
to advanc
cause, It
now here
by the Co
that said

tion be, and the same is hereby, g
and the cause assigned for argu
on Monday, April 12th next, after
cases heretofore assigned for that

(Per Mr. Chief Justice

Monday, January 26th 1920, continued

George Wallace, Albert A. Olson, Carl R. Kositzky, et al., Appellants,
683 vs.
Walker D. Hines, Director General of Railroads, Northern Pacific Railway Company, et al

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 12th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ohio Valley Water Company, Plaintiff in Error,
128 vs.
Ben Avon Borough et al.

On considerations of the motion to fix a day for the re-argument of this case,

It is now here ordered by that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the case assigned for reargument on Monday, March 1st next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Monday, January 26th 1920, c

370 J. Hartley Manners,
Petitioner
vs.
Oliver Morosco.

On consi
tion of
tion to
cause o
summa

docket. It is now here ordered
Court that the said motion be
the same is hereby granted,
case assigned for argument
day, March 1st next.
Per Mr. Chief Justice

166 International Bridge
Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The People of the State
of New York,

It is
by th
that
case
stood
dock
reach

Per Mr. Chief Justice

628 Chicago, Milwaukee
& St Paul Railway
Company,
Petitioner
vs.
McCaull-Klinemore
Company

On
for
certio
to th
Stat
cuit
of A
for
Eight

Monday, January 26th, 1920, continued.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by the Court, that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Western Union Telegraph Company, Petitioner
vs.
638 Eugene E. Southwick

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Seventh Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Seventh Judicial District of the State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

655 The Yazoo and Mississippi Valley Railroad Company and The United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company, Petitioners vs. Nichols and Company. On Petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court, That the said Petition be and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

647 Atlanta Terminal Company Co., Petitioner vs. The United States of America. On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

Monday, January 26th 1920, continued.

for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

James G. Wilson, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Western Condensed Milk Company, Petitioner,
vs.
A. J. Benham et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

658

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel in support of as well as against the same, it is ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

666 Marie Equis,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States
of America.

Ninth Circuit.

On Petition
writ of cert
to the United
States Circ
Court of A
Peals for

On consideration of the Petit
for a writ of certiorari herein to
United States Circuit Court of
Peals for the Ninth Circuit, and
the argument of counsel thereon
had as well in support of as o
the same, it is now here ordered
this Court that the said Petition
and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice

675 Edwin Reitz,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States
of America.

Eighth Circuit.

On Petition
writ of certi
to the United
States Circ
Court of A
Peals for

On consideration of the Petition
a writ of certiorari herein to the Un
States Circuit Court of Appeals
for the Eighth Circuit and of the

Monday, January 26th 1920, (continued)

argument of counsel, the motion had as well as upon the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be and the same is hereby denied.

The Chief Justice announced that the Court will take a recess from Monday February 2d. to Monday March 1st next.

29 Orig. The State of Rhode Island, Complainant, vs. A. Mitchell Palmer, Attorney General et al.

On motions of Mr. Solicitor General King, leave is granted, to file motion to dismiss the bill of complaint herein.

506 Edward White, Commissioner of Immigration for the Port of San Francisco, Petitioner, vs. Chin Dong.

On motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the Petitioner.

Ex Parte In the Matter of J. E. Broussard et al, Petitioners,

-Orig'l-

The motion for leave to file petition for writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler and Mr. A. D. Lipscomb for the petitioner in support of the motion and by Mr. Horace Chilton in opposition thereto.

J. E. Broussard et al, Petitioners,
vs.
Walter J. Crawford, Trustee, &c.

640

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, and Mr. A. D. Lipscomb for the petitioners and by Mr. Horace Chilton for the respondent.

The City of New York, Appellant,
vs.
The Consolidated Gas Company of New York et al.

566

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George

H. Cowie in behalf of Mr. William

Burr for the appellant in support of the motion, and by Mr. John A. Garver for the appellee in opposition thereto.

612 Fred S. Thompson, Appellant, vs. Alexander H. Nichols. The motion to advance this cause under the 32d Rule, or to dismiss, affirm or transfer to summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Henry Butler for the appellee.

679 Dallas Labor Republican Association et al., Appellants, vs. C. M. Cureton, Attorney General of the State of Texas et al. The motion for a supersedeas &c., herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. M. McCormick and Mr. R. M. Etheridge for the appellants in support of the motion and by Mr. C. M. Cureton for the appellees in opposition thereto.

The Mountain States Telephone

596 et al., (Plaintiffs in Error,) vs. The City and County of Denver.

tion of the Court by Mr. J. A. Mc
and Mr. Norton Montgomery for
defendant in error in support of
motion and by Mr. Milton Sm
and Mr. Charles R. Brock, for T
Plaintiffs in error, in opposition

The mo
to dism
or affi
herein
submitt
the cons

662 The Continental Bank of New York, (Petitioner,) vs. Ezra P. Prentice, Trustee, &c.,

of the Court by Mr. Myron D. Lee
for the Petitioner and by Mr. Jam
N. Rosenberg for the respondent.

The Petit
for a w
of certio
herein w
submitte
to the co
sideratio

663 Lucian Laughlin, (Petitioner) vs. The United States of America.

The Petiti
for a wri
of certior
herein w
submitte
The consi
tion of

Monday, January 26th 1920, continued.

Court by Mr. Theodore Mack for the petitioner, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Denison, for the respondent.

669 Gulf and Ship Island Railroad Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Earl Boone et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. B. E. Easton and Mr. D. J. Wills for the plaintiffs in error in support of the petition and by Mr. George Anderson for the defendants in error in opposition thereto.

670 A. J. Partan et al., Petitioners vs. The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas Mannix for the petitioners and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. Aubrey S. Ridgely for the respondent.

193

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company,
Petitioner
vs.
J. J. Gray.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of the said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

191

Michael U. Boehmer,
Petitioner,
vs.
Pennsylvania Railroad Company.

This cause was passed under the 26th Rule. Per stipulation of counsel.

194

James A. Keown,
Petitioner
vs.
Mary E Keown et al

day, January 26th 1920, continued.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Massachusetts.

It is ordered by the Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of prosecution.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Ohio State Telephone Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The City of Columbus, Ohio.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio and the plaintiff in error having been three times solemnly called by the Marshal to come into Court and prosecute its writ of error, and failing to appear, it is, therefore, in pursuance of the 16th rule of this Court, and on the motion of Mr. Frederick S. Dyer, on behalf, of counsel for the defendant in error, hereby ordered and adjudged by this Court, that this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs;

said Supreme Court to be proc
in according to law and justice
Per Mr. Chief Justice W

197

Blumenstock Brothers
Advertising Agency,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The Curtis Publishing
Company.

This ca
was pu
mitted
the con
tion of
Court b
Mr. Cob

C. A. Ryffle for the plaintiff in erro
by Mr. Amos C. Miller for the d
Feudant in error.

186

Annie Harris formerly
Annie Francis et al.
Appellants,
vs.
Harry A. Bell, et al.

This cau
was ar
by Mr.
C. Wade
The ap
and by
William M. Matthews for the ap
Pellees.

187

Meccano Limited,
Petitioner
vs.
John Wanamaker,
New York.

Monday, January 26th, 1920, continued.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Reeve Lewis for the Petitioner, and continued by Mr. N. A. Poulmin for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, January 27th 1920 —

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorables Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph R. McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Associate Justices

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Philip Pitt Campbell, it is ordered that James M. Reid, Esquire, of Parsons, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John L. Endall, Esquire, it is ordered that Alfred Zuger, Esquire, of Bismark, State of North

nday, January 27th 1920, continued

Dakota, be admitted to practice as
an attorney and counsellor of this
Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court
in this behalf by Mr. William M. Hast
ings it is ordered that Riley Cleveland,
Esquire, of Okmulgee, State of Oklahoma
be admitted to practice as an attorney
and counsellor of this Court, and he
was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in
this behalf by Mr. Howard Mansfield
it is ordered that Franklin Grady, Es-
quire, of New York City, be admitted to
practice as an attorney and counsellor
of this Court, and he was sworn accord-
ingly.

On motion first made to the Court
in this behalf by Mr. L. Mirriweather
Smith it is ordered that C. Poster
Cable, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State
of California be admitted to prac-
tice as an attorney and counsellor
of this Court, and he was sworn
accordingly.

Monday, January 26th 1920, continued.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr Carlos Bee, it is ordered that Gordon Boone, Esquire, and Walter A. Timon, Esquire of Corpus Christi, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

206 Frank P. Chesbrough, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Mary L. Holtch Kiss, et al.

The death of Mary Schreiber formerly Mary L. Holtch Kiss, one of the defendants in error herein, suggested, and appearance of Northern Trust Company, executor of the last will of Mary Schreiber, deceased, as a party defendant in error, filed and entered, on motion of Mr. E. S. Clark for the defendants in error.

199 The Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railway Company, Defendant, vs. The United States.

This cause was passed per Stipulation of counsel.

202

187

190

196

Tuesday, January 27th, 1920, continued.

Ana Maria Sugar Company, Inc., Petitioner, vs. The United States.

This cause was passed per stipulation of counsel.

Meccano Limited, Petitioner, vs. John Wanamaker, New York.

The argument continued by Mr. A. A. Doubleman for the respondent and concluded by Mr. Reeve Lewis for the petitioners.

The Board of Public Utility Commissioners, Petitioners, vs. Anchaustic & Company et al. Petitioners and by Mr. Alexander Britton for the respondent.

This cause was argued by Mr. Chester J. Gerkins and Mr. Edward S. Bailey for the

New York Central Railroad Company, Petitioner vs.

Tuesday, January 27th, 1920, continued

This cause was argued by Mr. Howard Lewis for the petitioner and by Mr. Albert H. Miller for the respondent.

250 The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Josiah V. Thompson. The plaintiff in error.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. W. C. Herron for

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Wednesday, January 28th 1920

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Jacob Rogers, it is ordered that Joseph Walsh, Esquire, of New Bedford, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chauncey Clark,

Esquire, of Fulton, State of Missouri be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf, by Mr. Thomas E. Robertson, it is ordered that John A. Wenner, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. M. Newlitt, it is ordered that William N. Vann, Esquire, of Lenapah, State of Oklahoma, be admitted practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

207

James A. Peterson,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was passed pursuant to the 26th Rule.

Louis C. Dilg, Jr.
Sole surviving executor
&c.,

Wednesday, January 28th, 1920, continued.

209 The United States. vs. 26th Rule.

This cause was passed pursuant to the

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Josiah V. Thompson.

250 This argument of this cause was continued by Mr. W. C. Herron for the Plaintiff in error and concluded by Mr. J. E. B. Cunningham for the defendant in error.

The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, et al., Petitioners vs. Fred Ward.

198 This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. J. Roberts; Mr. W. H. Moore; Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage; Mr. Sidney A. Talafero and Mr. W. D. Hickinson for the Petitioners, and by Mr. W. S. Pendleton for the appellee.

Wednesday, January 28th, 1920, con

200 The United States, Appellant;
vs.
Nederlandsch-Amerikaansches Stoomvaart Maatschappij (Holland American Lijn)

by Mr. Howard Mansfield for Appellees.

This c
was a
by Mr
Assist
Attorn
eral h
for th
Appellan

203 Leo Weidhorn, Petitioner,
vs.
Benjamin A. Levy, (Trustee), &c.,

and continued by Mr. Lee Man- for the respondent.

The argum
of this ca
was comm
by Mr. Pe
Mr. Blat
the petitio
Lee Man

Proclamation being made the Co
is adjourned until tomorrow at tw
o'clock.

Thursday, January 29th, 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. G. Henderson, it is ordered that Louis A. Fecher, Esquire of Milwaukee State of Wisconsin and Eloi Bauers, Esquire of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

(Thursday, January 29th, 1920, continued.)

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Stanley H. Willis, it is ordered that Marcellus Donald Redlich, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, and George William Holt, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

210 Postal Telegraph-Cable Company, Petitioners, vs. J. L. Nicholson. This cause was passed per stipulation of counsel.

211 Piedmont & Georges Creek Coal Company, Petitioner vs. Seaboard Fisheries Company, Claimant. This cause was passed per stipulation of counsel.

213 John W. Simpson et al., executors, &c., Appellants, vs. The United States. This cause was passed per stipulation of counsel.

Thursday, January 29th, 1920, continued.

The United States,
Appellant,
214. vs.
Atlantic Dredging
Company et al.

This cause was passed pursuant to stipulation of counsel.

Leo Weidhorn,
Petitioner,
203. vs.
Benjamin A. Levy,
Trustee, &c.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Lee M. Friedman for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. William M. Blatt for the petitioners.

Minneapolis, St Paul
& Sault Ste Marie
Railway Company
Plaintiff in Error,
204. vs.
Washburn Lignite
Coal Company;
and
Minneapolis, St Paul
& Sault Ste Marie Railway
Company
Plaintiff in Error,
28. vs.
The C. L. Merrick Company.

Thursday, January 29th, 1920, continued.

These causes were argued by Mr. John L. Erdall for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Alfred Zuger and Mr. Andrew Miller for the defendants in error.

Ralph N. Cameron et al., Appellants, vs. The United States of America. — by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Nebeker for the appellee.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William B. Prentiss for the appellants and continued

205

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Friday, January 30th 1920

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Edward Thomas it is ordered that John H. Stone, Esquire of Boston State of Massachusetts be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Melville

Friday, January 30th 1920, continued.

Edgar A. McCallister, Esquire of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. Leo P. Harlow it is ordered that Francis P. McEvoy, Esquire of Waterbury, State of Connecticut be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas M. Baker, it is ordered that Samuel N. Crowe, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas Sterling it is ordered that Perry R. Loucks, Esquire of Watertown, State of South Dakota be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Friday, January 30th 1920, continued.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Dyer, it is ordered that Julian C. Harrison, Esquire of Ridgewood, State of New Jersey and Claire J. Baird, Esquire, of Omaha State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn according by

294 C. C. Calhoun, Petitioner vs. Bland Massie.

On motion of Mr Charles P. Consaul for the Petitioner it is ordered that this cause be advanced to be heard with No. 85.

13 to 21. Wirt K. Winton, Administrator &c, and others, Appellants vs. Jack Amos and others known as the Mississippi Choctaws.

On motion of Mr. H. M. Scott it is ordered that this cause be assigned for argument on April 12, 1920.

The State of Missouri at the relation of City of Sedalia

Friday, January 30th 1920, continued.

215 vs. The Public Commission of Missouri, &c. This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John D. Lindsay for the defendant in error. No brief filed for the plaintiff in error.

Everglades Drainage League et al., Appellants, vs. Napoleon B. Broward Drainage District et al. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida.

216 It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellants to dismiss this appeal has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs. Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The City of Dutton, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Public Service Commission of Missouri, &c. This cause was submitted to the consideration of the

218

Friday, January 30th 1920, continued.

Eugene C. Bostmeyer and Mr. John Robison Baker for the plaintiff in Error, and by Mr. John M. Lindsay for the defendant in error.

222 W. F. Harris et al, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Missouri State Life Insurance Company. This cause was passed per stipulation of counsel.

223 Jose Lopez Garcia Appellant, vs. Orval P. Townshend, commanding officer, Camp Las Casas. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for Porto Rico.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Friday, January 30th 1920

205 Ralph H. Cameron et al. Appellants, vs. The United States of America. Orders for the appellees.

206 Frank P. Shelbrough Plaintiff in Error, vs. Northern Trust Company, Executor &c, et al. Edward S. Clark for the defendant in error.

208 Kiamesses River Power Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Carolina-Tennessee Power Company. by Mr. Julius C. Martin for defendant in error.

Friday, January 30th 1920, continued.

Ash Sheep Company, Appellant,

vs.

212 The United States of America;

and

Ash Sheep Company, Plaintiff in Error,

vs.

285 The United States of America.

This cause was argued by Mr. C. B. Nolan for the appellant and plaintiff in error and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Nebeker for the appellee and defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at twelve o'clock.

Monday, February, 2d 1920 —

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Mahlon Pitney
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. C. Boyle, it is ordered that Frederic O'Berge Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General King it is ordered that Lucius Q. C. Lamar, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted

Monday, February 2d 1920, continued.

to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Horace G. Jones, it is ordered that Robert P. Reeder Esquire of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lawrence A. Fowler it is ordered that James Bertram Burns Esquire of Napa, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr S. R. Prince it is ordered that Carroll T. Prince Esquire of Mobile and John McDuffie Esquire of Monroeville, State of Alabama be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this

Monday, February 2d 1920, continued

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Nottle Smith it is ordered that Walter S. Sanders, Esquire, of Cedartown, State of Georgia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Charles D. Henry,
as Sole Executor
under the last will
& Testament of Arthur
P. Hendricks, deceased,
Appellant,
vs.
The United States.

Appeal from
the Court
of Claims.

162

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from ~~the transcript of the record from~~ the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

386

Monday, February 2d 1920, continued:

Brooks-Scanlon Company, Petitioners
vs.
Railroad Commission of Louisiana.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court,

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Mountain States Telephone and Telegraph Company, and The Public Utilities Commission of the State of Colorado,

596

The City and County of Denver. vs In error t Supreme of the St Colorado

This cause came on to be hear the transcript of the record from Supreme Court of the State of rado and on motion to dismi affirm which was argued b pel.

On consideration whereof, It now here ordered and adjudged this Court that the writ of erro this cause, be, and the same is by dismissed for the want of j duction.

Per M. Chief Justice M

Ex Parte In the Matter of J. E. Brousard et al. (Petitioners.

-Orig. -

On consid of the mo for leave -file a Pe -for a writ

mandamus herein),

It is now here ordered by t Court that the said motion be, a the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice M

Monday, February 2d 1920, continued

Edward White, Commissioner of Immigration for the Port of San Francisco, Petitioner
506 vs.
Chin Dong.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 12th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

The City of New York, Appellant,
566 vs.
The Consolidated Gas Company of New York et al.

On considerations of the motions to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 12th next, after the cases heretofore assigned that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Monday, February 2d 1920, continued

612 Fred S. Thompson, Appellant vs. Alexander N. Nichols. It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the Summary docket and assigned for Monday, March 1st next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

679 Dallas Labor Temple Association et al., Appellants, vs. C. M. Cureton, Attorney General of the State of Texas, et al. On consideration of the motion for a writ of supersedeas or for an order pending the decree dissolving the restraining order herein, or a temporary injunction to maintain the status quo pending the appeal, and of the argument of counsel therefor had as well in support of as against the same,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

640

662

Monday, February 2d 1920, continued

J. E. Broussard
et al.,
Petitioners
vs.
Walter J. Crawford,
Trustee in Bankruptcy of Moore
& Bridgeman, Bankrupts.

On Petition for writ of certiorari to The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court, that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Continental Bank
(New York),
Petitioner,
vs.
Ezra P. Prentice, Trustee in Bankruptcy of
Clarence C. Perkins, etc.

Monday, February 2d 1920, contin

On petition for writ of certio
to the United States Circuit Co
of Appeals for the second Circ

On consideration of the pet
for a writ of certiorari herein to
United States Circuit Court of
Peals for the Second Circuit a
of the argument of counsel there
had, as well in support of as
against the same it is now her
ordered by this Court that the pe
petition be, and the same is he
denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice

665

Lucian Laughlin
Petitioner
vs.
The United States
of America

On petition
for writ of
certiorari t
the United
States Cir
Court of
Peals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the peti
for a writ of certiorari herein to
United States Circuit Court of Ap
Peals for the Fifth Circuit and
the argument of counsel there
had, as well in support of as
against the same it is now here ord
by this Court that the said petition be
the same is hereby denied.

Monday, February 2d 1920, continued.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

669. Gulf & Ship Island Railroad Company and B. E. Eaton and N. P. Stewart, Sureties, (Plaintiff in Error), vs. Carl Boone, Robert Boone, and Annie Boone, by John Boone their next friend.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

670. A. J. Partan and W. M. Reiss, Petitioners vs. The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for

States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

See Mr. Chief Justice White

243 The United States, Appellant, vs. The Omaha Tribe of Indians. The motion to remand this cause to the Court of Claims for additional findings was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Davis for the appellant in support of the motion and by Mr. C. A. Muri llat, Mr. C. J. Kappler and Mr. Niram Chase for the appellee in opposition thereto.

244 The Omaha Tribe of Indians, Appellants, vs. The United States. The motion for an order that the Court of Claims certify the

to this Court was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr C. N. Merillat Mr. Charles J. Kappler, and Mr. Miram Chase for the appellant.

687 The Postal Telegraph Cable Company, Petitioner vs. Bowman and Bull Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. E. L. Smith in behalf of Mr. Jacob E Wilus and Mr. Leon A Berezniak for the petitioner and by Mr. Edwin A Cassels for the respondent.

23 Orig. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Complainant, vs. The State of West Virginia; and

24 Orig. The State of Ohio, Complainant, vs. The State of West

The motion for reference to and appointment of a Special Master was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. Leo Weil

Monday, February 2d 1920, continued.

counsel for complainants.

23 Orig'l. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Complainant, vs. The State of West Virginia, and The State of Ohio, Complainant, vs. The State of West Virginia.

The motion to consolidate these causes, for the appointment of a commissioner and for other directions submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr Fred O. Blue in behalf of counsel for the defendant.

421 American Steel Foundries, Petitioner vs. James T. Newton, Commissioner of Patents.

The motion for leave to file brief and to make oral argument in this cause on behalf of the Simplex Electric Heating Company was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. E. Riordan in that behalf.

Monday, February 2d 1920, continued.

Herman M. Waitzfelder, Petitioner
vs.
700 Ralph S. Moore, Trustee &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. H. Garrett in behalf of Mr. James McNamara for the petitioner and by Mr. Benjamin Yoseph for the respondent.

Clarence E. Reed, Petitioner
vs.
659 Hughes Tool Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Melville Church, Mr. Edwin P. Merrick and Mr. William H. Hall for the petitioner and by Mr. Frank Andrews for the respondent.

Gutierrez Hermanos, Petitioner
vs.
661 The Insular Collector of Customs.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David A.

and by Mr. Dana T. Gallup, & Mr. Lawrence McKedrick, and Mr. Charles Marvin for the respondent.

673 Wabash Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Charlotte Shuhan, Administratrix &c. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Prudence B. McKinney for the petitioner and by Mr. C. C. LeForgee for the respondent.

674 Norfolk-Southern Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. M. K. Owens. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. N. B. Rodman, Jr. and Mr. N. B. Rodman for the petitioner.

688 The Malleable Iron Range Company, Petitioner vs. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the

Monday, February 2d 1920, continued

Thomas C. Banning and Mr. Samuel Walker Banning for the petitioner and by Mr. Harry C. Howard and Mr. Fred L. Chappell for the respondent.

695 Robert L. Dirk, Petitioner, vs. Okmulgee Window Glass Company. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. N. Higgins and Mr. P. O. Berge, for the petitioner and by Mr. William M. Matthews for the respondent.

277 Lafayette L. Simmons, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Joe Ward. The motion to dismiss herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Laird R. Radovsky for the defendant in error in support of the motion and by Mr. Edward C. Stone for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday March 1st next at twelve o'clock

Monday, March 1st 1920, —

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green Esquire, Marshal.
James H. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General King it is ordered that Edward Schoen, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Frierson, it is ordered that John S. Frankle, Esquire, of Chattanooga, State of Tennessee

Monday, March 1st 1920, continued

attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. P. Kirby it is ordered that A. W. Cobyns, Esquire of Little Rock, State of Arkansas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sidney M. Ballou it is ordered that William T. Rawleigh, Esquire, of Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas W. Gregory it is ordered that Robert J. McMillan, Esquire of San Antonio, State of Texas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Monday, March 1st 1920, continued.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hannis Taylor, it is ordered that Lloyd J. Brank, Esquire, of Gordon. Robert A. Reick, Esquire of Mackville; and William Charles Devitt, Esquire, of Ashland, State of Pennsylvania be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph M. Cox it is ordered that Otto C. Wierum, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James Bertram Burns it is ordered that Harry K. Lynch, Esquire, of Winchester, State of Virginia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S.R. Prince, it is ordered that R. C. McBee, Esquire,

Monday, March 1st 1920, continued.

be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. D. Smith, it is ordered that Lawrence E. Brown, Esquire, of Scottsboro, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Claudius R. McAtee, it is ordered that Claude Stendon, Esquire, of Pawhuska, State of Oklahoma be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas L. Blanton, it is ordered that A. W. Hurst, Esquire, of Ranger State of Texas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur Hellen, it is ordered that J. Frank Stanley, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Seth Shepard it is ordered that George N. Mitchell, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Stanley D. Willis, it is ordered that R. Hudley Kohler, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chester J. Gerkin, it is ordered that Ernest B. Lyons, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was

sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Benjamin Micou it is ordered that Neil P Steere, Esquire, and Charles H. Kline, Esquire, of Anniston, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellor of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Horace L. B. Atkisson it is ordered that A. Johnston Ackiss, Esquire of Virginia Beach, State of Virginia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Matthew P. Chapman, and Mark C. Chapman, Petitioners, vs. John A. Wintroath. 117

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District

counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

123 National Lead Company, Appellant, vs. The United States. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Monday, March 1st 1920, continued.

Kansas City Southern Railway Company, Appellant,
vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

New York Central Railroad Company, Petitioner
vs.
Wilbur N. Mahoney.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of Lucas County, State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of Lucas County, State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is

by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

See Mr. Justice Clarke.

(Mr. Justice Day and Mr. Justice Van Devanter concur in the result.)

212 Ash Sheep Company, Appellant, vs. The United States of America. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Montana.

See Mr. Justice Clarke.

Monday, March 1st 1920, continued.

The Shea Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of America.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Montana.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Roberto Gayon,
Appellant and
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Thomas H. McCarthy,
U.S. Marshal for the Southern District of New York, et al.

Appeal from and in error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Monday, March 1st 1920, continued.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court, that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

55

The Milwaukee Electric Railway and Light Company, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The State of Wisconsin ex rel. City of Milwaukee.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

March 1st 1920, continued.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

utting:
: Justice Pitney
Justice McReynolds.

P. McCloskey,
laintiff in Error,
vs.
M. Robin, Sheriff
ar County,
s.

In error to the Court of Criminal Appeals of the State of Texas.

s cause came on to be heard on transcript of the record from the of Criminal Appeals of the of Texas, and was argued by

consideration whereof, It is now ered and adjudged by this that the judgment of the said l Criminal Appeals in this be, and the same is hereby d with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis

ee
tioner,
vs.
f Georgia
n Company

Monday, March 1st 1920, continued.)

On writ of certiorari to this Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The Grand Trunk Western Railway Company, Appellant, vs. The United States. Appeal from the Court of Claims

163

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

Jan. 1st March 1st 1920, continued.

Present: Mr. Justice Brandeis.

K. P. Chisbrough, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Thurn Must Bornstein, Executor of Mary Schuidueiser, deceased, (formerly Mary L. Notchkiss) (Eva Woodworth, and Marga. V. Smalley.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Monday, March 1st 1920, continued.

567 The United States of America (Plaintiff in Error), vs. A. Schrader's Son (Inc.) In error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds dissenting:
Mr. Justice Holmes
Mr. Justice Brandeis
(Mr. Justice Clarke concurs in the result.)

531

580

onday, March 1st 1920, continued.

Charles B. Shaffer, Appellant,
vs.
Frank C. Carter, State Auditor, and Abner Bruce, Sheriff of Creek County, Oklahoma. —

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

Charles B. Shaffer, Appellant,
vs.
Frank C. Carter, State Auditor, and Abner Bruce, Sheriff of Creek County, Oklahoma. —

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the

for the Eastern District of Ok[la]
and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It
now here ordered, adjudged and
decreed by this Court that the d
of the said District Court in th
cause be, and the same is here
affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

548

Eugene M. Davis as
Comptroller of the State
of New York,
Appellant,
vs.
The Yale & Towne Manu-
facturing Company.

Appea
from th
District
of the U
States
the Sou
District
New Yo

This cause came on to be heard
the transcript of the record from the
District Court of the United States
the Southern District of New York a
was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It
now here ordered, adjudged and d
creed by this Court that the decree
the said District Court in this ca
be, and the same is hereby, affirm
with costs.

Monday, March 1st 1920, continued.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.
(Mr. Justice McReynolds concurs in the result.)

Jett Bros. Distilling Company, Plaintiff in Error,
108 vs.
City of Carrollton.

In error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

Henry Farncomb, Emma Donahue, Henry Lorie et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
110 vs.
The City & County of Denver et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado.

This cause came on to be heard
the transcript of the record from t
Supreme Court of the State of Co
and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It i
here ordered and adjudged by this
that the judgment of the said Su
Court, in this cause be, and the sa
is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

127

David Goldsmith,
Rebecca Lotk, Esther
S. Goldsmith et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The George G. Pruden-
gast Construction
Company.

In error to
Supreme C
of the St
of Misso

This cause came on to be hear
on the transcript of the record from
the Supreme Court of the State of
Missouri, and was argued by coun

On consideration whereof, It is
now here ordered and adjudged by
Court that the judgment of the sa
Supreme Court in this cause, be, an
the same is hereby affirmed with c

Per Mr. Justice Day.

Monday, March 1st 1920, continued.

198 The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company and W. J. Carney, Petitioners, vs. Fred Ward. On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

330 Pennsylvania Gas Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Public Service Commission Second District of the State of New York, The City of Jamestown, New York et al. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

Monday, March 1st 1920, continued.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with cost.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

Ex parte In the matter of J. Raymond Tiffany, as receiver, &c. Petitioner.

26 Orig.

(This cause came on to be heard on the petition for a writ of Mandamus and the return to the rule to show cause, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by the Court that said rule to show cause be discharged, and that said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

155

South Coast Steamship Company, Petitioner

68 vs.

J. C. Rudbach

Monday, March 1st 1920, continued.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes

John L. Bates, Receiver of the National City Bank of Cambridge, Massachusetts, Appellant, vs. Cummins Wheeler Administrator of the Estate of Edwin Wheeler, deceased;

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna
Mr. Justice Pitney
Mr. Justice Clarke

ministrator of the Estate of Edwin Wheeler, deceased.

Appellant,

156 vs.

John L. Bates, Receiver of the National City Bank of Cambridge Massachusetts;

John L. Bates, Receiver of the National City Bank of Cambridge, Massachusetts

Appellant;

157 vs.

John M. Shaw, Executor of George N. Gale, deceased, Sumner Wheeler and Edward A. Barber;

and

John L. Bates, Receiver of the National City Bank of Cambridge, Massachusetts,

Appellant,

158 vs.

Clarence Alfred Bunker and John H. Hardy, Administrators, etc., of George E. Richardson, deceased.

Appeals from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

Monday, March 1st 1920, continued.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be modified by charging the estate of Edwin Heinsen with interest from January 1, 1916, to June 1, 1918, upon the sum found to be due, and as so modified, be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice McKenna.

Mr. Justice Pitney.

(Mr. Justice Van Devanter and Mr. Justice Brandeis took no part in the decision of these cases).

Fort Smith Lumber Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs.

ex rel. John H. Arbuckle, Attorney General. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Fort Smith Lumber Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Arkansas ex rel. John H. Arbuckle, Attorney General. 394 In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes

Monday, March 1st 1920, (continued.)

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna
Mr. Justice Day
Mr. Justice VanDevanter
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The United States of America.
Appellant,
vs.
United States Steel Corporation et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Day
Mr. Justice Pitney
Mr. Justice Clarke
(Mr. Justice McReynolds and Mr. Justice Brandeis took no part in the con-

270 Peter Schaefer
(Plaintiff in Error)
vs.
The United States of
America

In error
District C
the United
for the Ea
District
Pennsylva

This cause came on to be heard
transcript of the record from the D
Court of the United States for the
District of Pennsylvania and was
argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It
now here ordered and adjudged b
Court that the judgment of the sa
District Court in this cause be, a
the same is hereby reversed; and
this cause be, and the same is he
remanded to the said District Co
for further proceedings in conformit
the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McK

271 Paul Vogel,
(Plaintiff in Error)
vs.
The United States
of America.

In error t
District C
of the Un
States fo
Eastern
trict of P
Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be

Monday, March 1st 1920, Continued.

The transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

(Per Mr. Justice McKenna.)

272

Louis Werner
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of America.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the

be and the same is hereby affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Brandeis
Mr. Justice Holmes
Mr. Justice Clarke.

273

Martin Markoff
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of America.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Brandeis
Mr. Justice Holmes
Mr. Justice Clarke.

Monday, March 1st 1920, continued)

Herman Lem Ke,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of America.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

(per Mr. Justice McKenna).

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Brandeis
Mr. Justice Holmes
Mr. Justice Clarke).

Carbon Steel Company,
Petitioner
vs.
535
C. G. Lewellyn, Collector of Internal

Twenty-Third District of Pennsylvania) On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

(See Mr. Justice McKenna).

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Day
Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Forged Steel Wheel Company, Petitioner

526 vs.

C. G. Lewellyn, Collector

onday, March 1st 1920, continued.

of Internal Revenue
for the Twenty Third
District of Pennsylvania.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Day
Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

with Brothers Com-
ny,
Petitioner
vs.
heam Lederer,
llector of Internal

Monday, March 1st 1920, continued.

District of Pennsylvania. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Day
Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Cornelius A. Dunbar, Plaintiff in Error, — In error to the
160 vs. — Supreme Court
The City of New York. — of the State of New York.

Monday, March 1st 1920, continued).

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The Board of Public Utility Commissioners, Petitioners, vs. Enchanted & Company et al.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, ~~affirmed~~ reversed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

that their cause be; and the same is hereby remanded to the said

250

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Josiah V. Thompson. In error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is hereby ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte In the matter of the United States, Petitioner — Orig'l

On consideration of the motion for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus and petition therein,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the

same is hereby denied.
Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Appellant,
vs.
163 The United States.
Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby affirmed.
Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The City of Dutton, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
218 Public Service Commission of Missouri, composed of William G. Busby et al
In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from

Missouri) and was argued b
counsel.

On consideration whereof, I
now here ordred and adjudged
this Court, that the writ of error, in
cause, be, and the same is hereby
missed for the want of jurisdiction
Per Mr. Chief Justice White

The State of Missouri
at the relation of the City
of Sedalia,
Plaintiff in Error,
215 vs.
The Public Service Commis-
sion of Missouri, compose
of William G. Busby et al.

In error
The Sup
Court of
State of
Missou

This cause came on to be heard o
the transcript of the record from the
Supreme Court of the State of Missouri
was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is
here ordred and adjudged by this
Court that the writ of error in this
cause be, and the same is hereby
missed, for the want of jurisdiction
Per Mr. Chief Justice Wh

Monday, March 1st 1920, continued.

277. LaDorest L. Simmons, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Joe Ward. In error to the Superior Court of the State of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Superior Court of the State of Massachusetts and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

no. — Kosta Kisiw, Petitioner, vs. The State of California. On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this case and that the Clerk of this Court be directed to file the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

243 The United States, Appellant, vs. The Omaha Tribe of Indians. On cross of the mi remand cause to of claim additions

ings of fact,

It is now here ordered by th that the said motion be, and the is hereby, denied.

See Mr. Chief Justice W

244 The Omaha Tribe of Indians, Appellant, vs. The United States. It is ord the Court the further sideration the motion an orde

the Court of Claims directing it to the whole record in this case to the be, and the same is hereby, post until the hearing of the cause on merits.

See Mr. Chief Justi

674 Norfolk Southern Railroad Company, Petitioner vs. M.R. Cuvene. On petition will of cer to the Su Court of C State of N Carolina

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina & the argument of counsel in support of the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

See Mr. Chief Justice White

659 Clarence E. Reed, Petitioner, vs. Hughes Tool Company. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

See Mr. Chief Justice White

661 Gutierrez Hermanos, Petitioners, vs. The Insular Collector

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

673

Wabash Railway Company, Petitioner
vs.
Charlotte Sheehan, Administratrix of the Estate of Richard C. Sheehan, deceased.

On petitions for writ of certiorari to the Appellate Court, Third District, State of Illinois.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Appellate Court, Third District, State of Illinois, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is

687.

688.

Monday, March 1st 1920, continued

hereby, denied.
per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Postal Telegraph-
Cable Company,
Petitioner
vs.
Bowman & Bull
Company.

On Petition for
writ of certi-
orari to the
Supreme Court
of the State of
Illinois.

On consideration of the Petition
for a writ of certiorari herein to the
Supreme Court of the State of Illi-
nois and of the argument of coun-
sel thereupon had, as well in sup-
port of as against the same, it is
now here ordered by this Court that
the said Petition be and the same is
hereby, denied.
per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Malleable
Iron Range
Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
Fred E. Lee, as
Administrator &c.,
of the Estate of
Arthur K. Beckwith,

On petition for writ of ce
to the United States Circuit Co
Appeals for the Seventh Cir
On consideration of the pe
for a writ of certiorari herein, t
United States Circuit Court o
Peals for the Seventh Circuit
of the argument of counsel
upon had, as well in sup
as against the same, it is n
here ordered by this Court, tha
paid petition, be and the same
hereby, denied.

Mr. Chief Justice

695

Robert L. Dink,
Petitioner
vs.
Kanawha Window
Glass Company.
Eighth Circuit.

On petition
writ of cer
to the Unit
States Cir
Court of
Peals for

On consideration of the pe
for a writ of certiorari herein to
United States Circuit Court of
Peals for the Eighth Circuit an
the argument of counsel thereupo
had, as well in support of as ag
the same it is now here ordered
by this Court, that the said petitio
be, and the same is hereby, denie

Monday, March 1st 1920, continued.

See Mr. Chief Justice White.

700 Heeman M. Martell, Petitioner, vs. Ralph S. Moore, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Burt P. White, Bankrupt. On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

See Mr. Chief Justice White.

125 Kate C. Archer, Administratrix of the Estate of George F. Archer, deceased, and Kate C. Archer, Appellant. vs. The United States.

Monday, March 1st 1920, contin

220

The United States
Appellant,
vs.
Kate Archer, Administratrix of the Estate of George F. Archer, deceased, and Kate Archer.

Appeal
the Court
Claims

This cause came on to be h
on the transcript of the record
the Court of Claims on appea
cross-appeal and was argued
counsel.

On consideration whereof, the
Court being equally divided in
opinion, It is now here ordere
adjudged by this Court that
judgment of the said Court of
Claims, in this cause, be, and
same is hereby affirmed.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Wh

85

Sue Erskine Newmans,
Administratrix, etc.,
et al.,
Appellants,
vs.
Ida M. Moyers et
al., etc.; and

86 Carter Glass, Secretary of the Treasury, et al., Appellants. vs. LeRoy Forest L. Ormes, Administrator, &c. David F. Houston, present Secretary of the Treasury substituted for Carter Glass former Secretary on motion of Mr. Solicitor General King, for the appellants.

319 The United States, Appellant, vs. North American Transportation and Trading Company. The motion to remand this cause to the Court of Claims for additional findings of fact was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the appellant and by Mr. Abram R. Serven and Mr. Burt E. Barlow for the appellee.

636 Edgar C. Caldwell, Appellant, vs. W. E. Barker, Sheriff &c. Leave granted to file brief as amicus curiae herein on motion of Mr. Solicitor General King for the United States.

Monday, March 1st 1920, continued.

George C. Howe Jr.,
Appellant,
696 vs.
Thomas J. Boynton,
U.S. Attorney &c., et al.

for the appellee.

This cause was advanced to be heard with No. 29, Original, on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Kuig.

The State of Rhode Island,
Complainant,
29 Orig'l vs.
A. Mitchell Palmer,
Attorney General et al.

Leave granted to file brief as amicus curiae, on behalf of twenty-one states on motion of Mr. Charles E. Hughes for said states.

Kentucky Distilleries & Warehouse Company,
Appellant,
752 vs.
W. V. Gregory, District Attorney etc., et al.

Appellees.

This cause was advanced to be heard with No. 29, Original, on motion of Mr. William Marshall Bullitt for the

ndaw, March 1st 1920, continued.

The State of New Mexico, Complainant, vs. The State of Colorado. — Leave granted to file answer and cross-bill on motion of Mr. E. T. Taylor, behalf of counsel for the defendant.

The State of Missouri, Complainant, vs. Ray P. Holland, U.S. ame Warden. — Leave granted to file brief as amicus curiae herein on motion of Mr. F. M. ay law ki in behalf of Mr. Louis Marshall.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, vs. The State of Texas. — Leave granted to file answer and counter claim, on motion of, er. Thomas N. Gregory for the defendant.

W. Atkins, Petitioner vs. G. Gavitt. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to consideration of the Court by Mr. ster S. Penfield, Mr. N. B. Spencer

the petitioners.

Union Trust Company of Rochester, New York et al.,
Petitioners,
vs.
No. — Woodward & Lothrop.

The motion for leave to file brief as amicus curiae in opposition to the petition for writ of certiorari was submitted by Mr. William G. Johnson for the petitioners.

Kansas City,
Plaintiff in Error,
328 vs.
The Public Service Commission of Missouri et al.

The motion to retax costs was submitted by Mr. C. R. McCune in behalf of the defendant in error.

The State of Missouri,
Appellant,
609 vs.
Ray P. Holland, U.S. Game Warden,
Evans Browne in that behalf.

Leave granted to file as amicus curiae in opposition of the motion

Chas. C. Bird, Limited,
Petitioner,
718 vs.
Frank K. Nowbery, as collector of internal revenue, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. F. K.

Ogilby in behalf of Mr. William V. Hodges for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General King and Mr. William C. Herron for the respondent.

Rederia Aktiebolaget Atlantic,
Petitioner
171 vs.
Aktiesels Kabet Korn-Og Foders Kompagniet.

Leave granted to file brief as amicus curiae herein on motion of Mr. Oscar R. Underwood, Jr., in that behalf.

Atchafalaya Land Company,
Petitioner
739 vs.
Paul Caddeville, Auditor, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr.

Frederick S. Tyler in behalf of Mr. George Gauvier, for the petitioner with

Ex parte in the Matter of James F. Bishop, administrator &c.,

Petitioners

- Orig'l

The motion for leave to file petition for writ of certiorari was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Frederick S. Dyer Esq. on behalf of Mr. Harry W. Standidge for the Petitioners

James F. Bishop, Administrator &c., et al.

Petitioners,

vs.

709 of October Term 1918. Great Lakes Towing Company,

and

James F. Bishop, Administrator &c., et als.,

Petitioners,

No 897 of October Term 1918. vs.

Great Lakes Towing Company.

The motion was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Frederick S. Dyer Esq. on behalf of Mr. Harry W. Standidge for the Petitioners

John P. Galbraith,

Petitioner,

697 vs.

John Vallely Trustee, &c.,

The Petition for a writ of certiorari was submitted

Monday, March 1st 1920, continued:

tion of the Court by Mr. S. H. Wellcs in behalf of Mr. Fred B. Hodges for the petitioner.

Henry Kuchman,
Petitioner,
vs
The United States of America.
746

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. M. Chambers, in behalf of Mr. Harrison P. Luidabury, for the petitioner.

Hudson Navigation Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
J. Aron & Company, Inc., et al.
711

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Seth Shepard and Mr. Stuart G. Gibbones for the petitioner and by Mr. Charles R. Hickox and Mr. George A. Mitchell for the respondents.

Prudential Insurance Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
718

Monday, March 1st 1920, continued.

The motion to dismiss in this cause, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick H. Bacon, for the defendant in error in support of the motion and by Mr. Samuel H. Brodyce, Jr., and Mr. Thomas M. White, for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

669 The Gulf & Ship Island Railroad Company, et al, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Carl Boone et al, etc.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George Anderson for the defendants in error in support of the motion and by Mr. T. J. Wills and Mr. B. E. Eaton for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

692 Cheatham Electric Switching Device Company, Appellant, vs. Transit Novelty Company, et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr.

Monday, March 1st 1920, continued.

Johnston for the defendant in Error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Albert M. Austin for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

677 John M. Anderson
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Peter M. Marr as former auditor &c., et al.

(The petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Muenay for the plaintiff in Error.)

Seasongood

678 The Chicago Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co.,
Petitioner,
vs.
O. O. Swaim.

(The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph G. Gamble for the petitioner and by Harriet B. Evans for the respondent.)

682 J. B. Pollard,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States of America

(The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to

of the Court by Mr. William A. Colwell for the petitioners and by Mr. Robert P. Stewart and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

686 Ada Griffith,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benjamin C. Bachrach for the petitioners and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

701 Frederick M. Kilmer Trustee &c.,
Petitioner,
vs.
Charles A. Keith, Trustee &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Elbridge R. Anderson for the petitioners and by Mr. Lee M. Friedman for the respondent.

Rome Land etc. et al.,
Petitioners,

Monday, March 1st 1920, continued.

703 Equitable Trust Company of New York, The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wells A Blodgett and Mr. Clifford B. Allen, for the petitioner and by Mr. G. H. Murray, and Mr. Lawrence Greer, for the respondent.

Maria Eloisa Rocha, petitioner, vs. Emilia Duason y Patino et al. 704 The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. A. Kincaid for the petitioner.

Western Union Telegraph Company, petitioner vs. Addie Speight. 712 The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Francis Raymond Stark, Mr. Charles W. Tillett, and Mr. Thomas C. Guthrie for the petitioner.

The Phillips Com-

721 Petitioner,
vs.
Byron K. Everitt,
Trustee, etc.

The Petiti
a writ o
orari to
was sub
to the C
tion of the Court by Mr. William
Carpenter for the Petitioner and
Mr. Clarence A. Lightner for the
spondent.

722 Alfred R. Swann,
Petitioner,
vs.
W. W. Austell, Executor
&c; et al.

The Peti
for a w
certiora
herein
submit
to the C
tion of the Court by Mr. Daniel
Rountree and Mr. Clifford L. A
son for the Petitioner and by Mr
J. Spalding and Mr. Charles D.
Kiis for the respondent.

732 William F. Hannahan,
Petitioner,
vs.
Pacific Transport
Company.

The Petiti
a writ o
certiorar
was sub
to the co
tion of
Court by Mr. Silas B. Axtell for the
Petitioner and by Mr. Robert S. Erskine

Monday, March 1st 1920, continued.

E. B. Cagle, Administrator etc., Petitioner,
748 vs.
The Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James S. Manning for the petitioner and by Mr. Frederick H. McKenney and Mr. P. A. Willcox for the respondent.

Maryanne Shipping Company, Claimant &c.,
Petitioner,
750 vs.
Rambers Iron Works.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Horace L. Cheyney and Mr. Ralph J. W. Bullowa for the petitioner and by Mr. Frances Martin for the respondent.

Cricket Steamship Company,
Petitioner,
754 vs.
John P. Carey.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Cletus Keat-

B. Axtell for the respondent.

Commonwealth of Virginia,
Complainant,
vs.
2 Orig'l
State of West Virginia.

The acknowledgement of satisfaction of decree of this Court of June 14th 1915, in favor of the complainant, in this cause, was presented and ordered to be filed.

The State of New York,
Complainant,
vs.
14 Orig'l
International Nickel Company.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the bill of complaint in this cause, has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the bill of complaint in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed without costs to either party.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The State of New York,

Monday, March 1st 1920, continued.

Ingle
vs.
Standard Oil
Company.

It is hearing to the
Court that a
stipulation of
counsel for the
respective parties to dismiss the bill of
complaint in this cause has been filed.
Therefore in pursuance of said
stipulation, It is now here ordered,
adjudged and decreed by this Court, that
the bill of complaint in this cause be,
and the same is hereby dismissed
without cost to either party.
Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Wysong & Miles Com-
pany et al,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Planters National Bank
of Richmond, Virginia,

*
It appear-
ing to the
Court that
a stipula-
tion of coun-
sel for the
respective
parties to dismiss the writ of error in this
cause has been filed,
Therefore in pursuance of said stipulation
it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court
that the writ of error in this cause be, and the
same is hereby dismissed with costs.
Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State
of North Carolina.)

478 Wysong and Miles Company et al, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Bank of North America, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. In

It appearing to the Court that stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and judged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice W

612. Fred S. Thompson, Appellant, vs. Alexander N. Nichols of Maine. Appeal from the District Court of United S for the D

It appearing to the Court that stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged

Monday, March 1st 1920, continued.

deal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed without costs to either party.

See Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Penn Mutual Life Insurance Company, Petitioner,
199. vs.
Ephraim Lederer, Collector, &c.

This cause was passed pursuant to the 26th Rule, on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Kuhn,

for the respondent.

George S. Hawke, Plaintiff in Error,
582 vs.
Harvey C. Smith, Secretary of State of Ohio;
and
George S. Hawke, Plaintiff in Error,
601 vs.
Harvey C. Smith, Secretary of State of Ohio.

These cases were reassigned for argument on April 12th next after

Monday, March 1st 1920, continued

281

Canadian Northern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
Gus Eggen.

This cause was argued by Mr. William D. Mitchell for the petitioner and by Mr. Ernest A. Michel for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court adjourned until tomorrow at Twelve o'clock.

Tuesday March 2d 1920—

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph R. McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day.
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis.
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion duly made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Curtis it is ordered that Ike E. Lambert, Esquire, of Emporia, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion duly made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James D. Mann it is ordered that Gott-

State of Illinois be admitted
practice as an attorney an
counsellor of this Court and
was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the
Court in this behalf by Mr. C
Pomerene, it is ordered that A
E. Woode, Esquire, of Cincinna
State of Ohio be admitted to
tice as an attorney and coun
of this Court, and he was swo
accordingly.

On motion first made to the C
in this behalf by Mr. Warren G
is ordered that Sidney G. Kusworm,
of Clayton, State of Ohio be admi
to practice as an attorney and co
of this Court, and he was sworn a
ingly.

Philadelphia and Reading
Railway Company
Plaintiff in Error and Petitioner,

415 vs.

Margaret L. Hancock.

This
was a
by M
Georg
Penn
the C
in err

Petitioner and by Mr. Hannis Taylor

Tuesday, March 2d 1920, continued.

J. Hartley Manners,
Petitioner,
370 vs.
Oliver Morosco.

This cause was argued by Mr. David Gerber for the petitioner and by Mr. Charles H. Tuttle for the respondent.

The State of Missouri
Appellant,
609. vs.
Ray P. Holland, U.S. Game Warden.

This cause was argued by Mr. J. L. Harvey and Mr. John D. Lee for the appellant and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Pierson and Mr. Solicitor General Craig for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Wednesday, March 3d 1920 —

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met to-day at the Capitol. —

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James Clark McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices
Frank H. Grim Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened. —

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edmund K. Dabney, it is ordered that Alexander Lincoln, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn according ly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Soliciton General King it is ordered that Alonzo Mulder

be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Townsend, it is ordered that Stewart Stanley, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel E. Swayze it is ordered that Samuel R. Wachtell, Esquire, of Newyork City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clyde B. Aitchinson it is ordered that Charles E. McCulloch, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Wednesday, March 3d 1920, continued.

618 First National Bank of Carlton, Pennsylvania, Appellant, vs. John Skelton Williams, Comptroller, &c. This cause was argued by Mr John B Stanchfield for the appellant and by Mr. LaRue Brown and Mr. Solicitor General King for the appellees.

56 Peter Geddes et al Appellants, vs. Anaconda Copper Mining Company et al. Five hours allowed for the argument of this cause. Re-Argument commenced by Mr. D. J. Walsh for the appellants and continued by Mr. H. B. Rogers for the appellees.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Thursday, March 4th 1920

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Melville Church, it is ordered that Henry Horner Snelling, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Walzel,

Esquire), of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania), be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ernest Wilkinson it is ordered that Robert Stewart Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and ~~he was~~ sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Reese Turpin, it is ordered that John N. Lucas, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James R. Mann, it is ordered that North E. Gaylor, Esquire of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of Rhode
Island,

(Thursday, March 4th 1920, continued.)

29 Orig. D. vs. A. Mitchell Palmer, Attorney General, et al. This cause was assigned for argument on Monday next.

The Court thereupon, on motion of Mr. Assistant Attorney General Frierson, for the defendants.

Peter Geddes et al, Appellants, vs. Anaconda Copper Mining Company et al. The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. W. B. Rogers for the appellees and concluded by Mr. D. J. Walsh for the appellants.

36 Edgar S. Caldwell, Appellant, vs. W. P. Parker, Sheriff of Calhoun County, Alabama. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Henry E. Hawes for the appellant and continued by Mr. Neil P. Sterne for the appellees.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve

Friday, March 5th 1920

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met Today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion duly made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Dawson it is ordered that Jacob L. Newman, Esquire, and Joseph G. Wolber, Esquire of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion duly made to the Court in this behalf by Mr.

Friday, March 5th 1920, continued.

of Mankato, State of Minnesota be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. B. Jaynes it is ordered that Ralph H. Reeves, Esquire of Silsbee, State of Texas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. B. F. Wetter it is ordered that Walter S. Jackson Esquire of Lima, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lincoln Bryant, it is ordered that John Ross Delafield, Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn according by.

(Friday, March 5th 1920, continued.)

City of San Antonio et al.,
Appellants,
vs.
756 San Antonio Public Service Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of this Court by Mr. R. J. McMillan for the appellants.

H. N. Gill et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
225 The City of Dallas et al.

On error to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Fifth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is therefore in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Edgar C. Caldwell,
Appellant,
vs.
636. N. E. Cooper, Sheriff

Friday, March 5th, 1920, continued.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Neil P. Stevens and Mr. J. D. Smith for the appellee and concluded by Mr. Charles H. Kline for the appellant.

Walter Evans,
Plaintiff in Error,
v.
J. Rogers Gore, Deputy and acting Collector of Internal Revenue.

This cause was argued by Mr. Neil Brown Marshall, Bullitt and Mr. Edmund F. Trabue for the plaintiff in Error and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Thurston, for the defendant in error.

654

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
v.
Everett L. Simpson.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Thurston, for the plaintiff in error. No appearance for the defendant in error.

444

Ohio Valley Water Company,
Plaintiff in Error,

(Friday, March 5th 1920, continued.)

128 Ben Avon Borough et al. The reargument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William Watson Smith for the plaintiff in Error continued by Mr. Bernie St Evaire and Mr. Leonard K. Guiler for the defendants in error and by Mr. J. G. Buchanan for the plaintiff in Error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at twelve o'clock.

Monday, March 8th 1920

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorables Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General King, it is ordered that Fred A. Otis, Esquire, and Charles P. Sisson, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island; Charles Campbell, Jr., Esquire, of St Louis, State of Missouri, and Charles E. Hughes, Jr., Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accord-

Monday, March 8th, 1920, continued.

On motion, first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Sutherland, it is ordered that E.R. Callister, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, it is ordered that Harvey Given, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fritz Lanham it is ordered that Lindsley Madden Brown, Esquire of Fort Worth, State of Texas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Michael J. Lynch, it is ordered that Patrick P. Curran, Esquire, of Providence, State

onday, March 8th 1920, continued.

of Rhode Island be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry G. Miller it is ordered that Charles Thomas Randolph, Esquire, of Carmi; and Albert H. Rodenberg, Esquire, of Springfield, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hubert D. Fisher, it is ordered that Grover Newton McCormick, Esquire, of New Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert E. Evans, it is ordered that L. J. Dickinson, Esquire of Algona, State of Iowa be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Monday March 8th 1920, continued.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wm R. Wallace, it is ordered that William Mc. Herrup Jr, Esquire, of Newyork City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. G. Brandenburg it is ordered that Arthur C. Dayton Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George E Chamberlain it is ordered that Thomas A. Sullivan, Esquire of Buffalo State of Newyork be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr Frank P. Reed it is ordered that James Martin Gray Esquire of

Monday, March 8th, 1920, continued.

Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of Minnesota, Complainant,
vs.
The State of Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heard on the pleadings and proof, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed as follows:

That the boundary line between the two States must be ascertained upon a consideration of the situation existing in 1846, and accurately displayed by the Meade's chart. That when placed on this chart the boundary line midway between Rice's Point and Pig's Point and through the middle of Lower St. Louis Bay to and with the channel leading into Upper St. Louis Bay and to a point therein immediately south of the southern extremity of Grassy Point; thence westward along the most direct course through water not less than eight feet deep, eastward of Fisherman's Island and as indicated

Exhibit No. 1, approximately on
to the deep channel and immedia
the bar thereof, thence down said channel north of we
west of Big Island up stream
falls.

Within thirty days counsel
present a proper decree for carr
the opinion into effect. The cost
be equally divided between the
Per Mr. Justice McKenn

Mark Eisner as
Collector of United
States Internal
Revenue for the Third
District of the State
of New York,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Myrtle A. Macomber.

318

This cause came on to be hea
the transcript of the record from
the District Court of the United
States for the Southern District
New York, and was argued by
sel.

On consideration whereof, It
now here ordered and adjudged
Court that the judgment of the
District Court in this cause be,
the same is hereby

Monday, March 8th 1920, continued.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Holmes
Mr. Justice Day.
Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Brandeis
Mr. Justice Clarke.

Clinton H. Peirce,
Angelo Cano, Charles
Z. Zeilman, Charles
Nelson,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The United States of
America.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of New York.

234

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Holmes

Monday, March 8th 1920, continued.

413

The United States of America at the relation of the Kansas City Southern Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Interstate Commerce Commission.

In error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

418

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Court of Appeals with directions to reverse the judgment of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, and remand the cause to that Court with directions to grant a writ of mandamus in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

669

Monday, March 1st 1920, continued.

Prudential Insurance Company of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Robert T. Shuck. (In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Gulf and Ship Island Railroad Company, et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Earl Boone et al). (In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi and on motion to

by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

692. Cheatham Electric Switching Device Company, Appellant, vs. Daniel Newell Company et al. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday March 8th 1920, continued.

Union Trust Com-
pany of Rochester,
Neb. et al.,
vs.
Woodward & Lothrop

On consideration of the petition for the allowance of an appeal herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex Parte In the matter
of Jamie F. Bishop,
Administrator &c.,
Petitioner,

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of Pro-
hibition herein,
It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion, be and the same is ~~hereby~~ denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Jamie F Bishop,
Administrator of
Susie C. Plamondon
et al,
Petitioners,
vs.
Great Lakes Tow-
ing Company.

Monday, March 8th 1920, continued.

On consideration of the motion
leave to withdraw the original transcr
of record in these cases,

It is now here ordered by the Co
that the said motion be, and the
is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice W

The United States,
A&P. Appellants,
vs.
319
The North American
Transportation and
Trading Company.

On consi
tion of th
motion t
This cau
the Court
claims
additiona
ings of

It is now here ordered by the
Court that the said motion be,
the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice W

City of San Antonio
et al.,
A&P. Appellants,
vs.
756
San Antonio Public
Service Corporation.

On consi
tion of th
motion t
cause, I
now here
ordered

the Court that said motion be, and
cause is hereby denied without Pre

Per Mr. Chief Justice

Monday, March 8th 1920, continued.)

697 John P. Galbraith
Petitioner,
vs.
John Valley, Trustee
in Bankruptcy of
Conrad C. Reisweig,
Bankrupt.

On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, in support of the same, it is nowhere ordered by this Court that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

712 Western Union Telegraph Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
Addie Speight.

On Petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina and of the argument of

now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

746 Henry Kirchman, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. Second Circuit.

On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

678

677 John Mc Anderson, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Peter W. Meek, as former Auditor, E. S. Beaman, as Auditor and Charles Cooper, as Treasurer.

682

Monday, March 8th, 1920, continued.)

of Hamilton County, Ohio.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby postponed until the hearing of the case on the writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner,

vs.

O. C. Swaim.

On Petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa and of the argument of counsel thereon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

J. B. Pollard, Petitioner

vs.

Monday, March 8th, 1920, cont

of America) On Petition
writ of certi
to the United States Circuit Cou
Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the Pet
for a writ of certiorari herein to
United States Circuit Court of
Peals for the Fifth Circuit and
the argument of counsel thereupon
as well in support of as against
same, it is now here ordered by
Court that the said Petition be
the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice W

Ada Griffith,
Petitioner
686. vs.
The United States
of America.

On Petition
writ of cert
to the Unit
States Ci
Court of A
for the Seve

Circuit

On consideration of the P
for a writ of certiorari herein to
United States Circuit Court of
Peals for the Seventh Circuit, an
the argument of counsel thereupon
had, as well in support of as a
the same, it is now here ordered
Court that the said Petition be
the same is hereby denied.

Monday, March 8th, 1920, continued.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Frederick M. Kilmer
Trustee of Alice D.
Kilmer,
Petitioner,
701 vs.
Charles N. Keith, Trustee
in Bankruptcy of
National Piano Com-
pany, Bankrupt.

On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Rome Lane, on be-
half of himself and
others,
Petitioner,
703 vs.
The Equitable Trust

Monday, March 8th, 1920, continue

On petition for writ of cer
to the United States Circuit Court
Appeals for the Eighth Circui
On consideration of the peti
for a writ of certiorari herein to
United States Circuit Court of
Peals for the Eighth Circuit and
the argument of counsel thereu
had as well in support of as
against the same, it is now he
ordered by this Court that the
petition be, and the same is he
denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice T

(Maria) Eloisa Rocha,
Petitioner,
vs.
Emilia Nuason y Patino
and (Maria) Rocha de
Nes, et al.

7/04

On Peti
for writ
certiora
to the S
Supreme
of the P
Islands

On consideration of the petitio
for a writ of certiorari herein to
Supreme Court of the Philippine
Islands and of the argument of co
sel thereupon had, as well in sup
of as against the same, it is now
here ordered by this Court that th
said petition be, and the same
hereby, denied.

Monday, March 8th 1920, (continued.)

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

	Hudson Navigation Company, Petitioner, vs. J. Aron & Company, Inc., et al.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.
711		

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

	Chas. Bird, Limited, Petitioner, vs. Frank N. Nowbert, as collector of Internal revenue for the District of Colorado.	On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.
718		

On consideration of the petition for

Monday, March 8th 1920, continued

United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit of the argument of counsel therein had, as well in support of and against the same it is now ordered by this Court that the petition be, and the same is denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice

721

The Phillips Co Company, Petitioner,
vs.
Byron R Everitt, Trustee in Bankruptcy of The Springfield Realty Company.
Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and the argument of counsel thereon had as well in support of as against the same it is now ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice

Monday, March 8th, 1920, continued.)

Alfred R. Swann,
Petitioner
vs.
722 W. W. Austell, Executor of the will of Alfred Austell, deceased, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court, that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

William P. Hannahan,
Petitioner
vs.
732 Pacific Transportation Company, Limited.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition

Monday, March 8th 1920, continue

the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel as well in support of the same, as against the same, it is now hereby ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice

748

E. B. Cadle, Administrator of J. M. Williamson, deceased, Petitioner,

vs.

The Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and of the argument of counsel thereupon, had as well in support of as against the same, it is now hereby ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice

Monday, March 8th 1926, continued.

749 J. H. Atkins, Petitioner, vs. L. G. Garrett. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

750 Marianna Shipping Company, Claimant of Steamship "Marianna" Petitioner, vs. Ramberg Iron Works. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Ap-

argument of counsel in as well support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Cricket Steamship Company, Petitioner, vs. John P. Parry. 754

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Leslie C. Stallings, Appellant, vs. Maurice St. Clair, United States Marshal &c. 534

Monday, March 8th 1909, Continued:

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the appellee in support of the motion, and by Mr. N. B. Jaynes for the appellant in opposition thereto:

Chicago, Milwaukee and St Paul Railway Company, Petitioner
vs.
628. McCaull-Dinsmore Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by

Mr. Alexander C. King in behalf of counsel for the petitioner.

George C. Clemesha, Appellant,
696 vs.
Thomas J. Boynton, US Attorney &c., et al.;

Kentucky Distilleries & Warehouse Company, Appellant,
758. vs

Monday, March 8th 1920, continued.

Leave granted to file brief as amicus curiae on motion of Mr. Wayne B. Wheeler in that behalf.

no — Charles Kollmann, Petitioner vs. The United States. The motion for extension of time within which to submit a petition for writ of certiorari was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chester I. Gerkin, Mr Samuel P. Ansell and Mr. Edward D. Bailey for the petitioner.

312. John M. Panarevich, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The People of the State of Illinois. The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. D. Rodenberg, in behalf of Mr. Edward J. Brundage and Mr. Edward C. Fitch for the defendant in error in support of the motion and by Mr. Emory J. Smith for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

onday, March 8th 1920, continued.

The State of Rhode
Island,
Com'l. Complainant,
vs.
Mitchell Palmer,
Attorney General
et al.

Leave granted
to file brief
as amicus
curiae herein
on motion
of Mr. Elihu
Root in that
behalf.

Kentucky Whitestones
Warehouse Com-
pany,
A. Pollack,
vs.
T. B. Gregory, District
Attorney et al.

Leave granted
to file brief
as amicus
curiae herein
on motion
of Mr. Charles
E. Hughes Jr.

that behalf.

The State of New
Jersey,
Com'l. Complainant,
vs.
Mitchell Palmer,
Attorney General,
et al.

The motion
for leave
to file the
bill of com-
plainant in
this cause
was sub-
mitted to
consideration of the Court by
Mr. Thomas R. McCraw for the
Com'l. Complainant.

Monday, March 8th, 1920, Continued.

7 Orig'l — The State of Arkansas, Complainant, vs. The State of Mississippi, — The motion for the entry of an interlocutory decree and for the appointment of commissioners herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George F. Snyder for the counsel in this cause.

29 Orig'l — The State of Rhode Island, Complainant, vs. A. Mitchell Palmer, Attorney General et al. — Leave granted to file brief as amicus curiae herein on motion of Mr. Alexander Lincoln in that behalf,

733 — Missouri Pacific Railroad Company et al, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. N. A. F. Ault — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. Carter Pope in behalf of Mr. Robert E. Wiles and Mr.

in error with, leave file (printed) record hereafter.

694 United Mine Workers of America), et al., Petitioners, vs. Coronado Coal Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. G. L. Grant, Mr. Webb Covington and Mr. Henry Warrum for the petitioners.

709 Walter R. Britton, Trustee &c., Petitioner, vs. Union Investment Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harrison L. Schmitt for the petitioner and by Mr. William A. Lancaster, and Mr. Hazard R. Simpson for the respondent.

725 Walter M. Reuter et al., Petitioners vs.

Monday, March 8th 1920, continued

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Scothorn for the petitioners

226 Midland Linseed Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. American Liquid Fireproofing Company, et al. — This cause was continued per Stipulation of counsel.

128 Ohio Valley Water Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Ben Avon Borough et al. — The reargument of this cause was concluded by Mr. J. G. Buchanan for the Plaintiff in Error.

29 Orig. The State of Rhode Island, Complainant vs. A. Mitchell Palmer, Attorney General et al. — The argument on the motion to dismiss in this cause was commenced by Mr.

(Monday, March 8th, 1920, continued.)

Rice for the complainant and by continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Dawson in support of the motion.

Virginia and West Virginia Coal Company, Plaintiff in Error,
v.
Green Charles, for the defendant
262

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted by Mr. William A. Work in error in support of the motion and by Mr. M. Belcher and Mr. S. B. Avis for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, March 9th 1920

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorables Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James H. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William D. Guthrie it is ordered that Oscar M. Ehrhorn of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Patrick Henry Kelley it is ordered that John A.

Tuesday, March 9th 1920 —

Massachusetts be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert S Hume it is ordered that Dwight Davis Graves, Esquire, of Bridgeport State of Connecticut be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn, accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Claude Hendon it is ordered that Robert R. Hendon, Jr. Esquire, of Shawnee, State of Oklahoma be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Royal C. Johnson it is ordered that Webster Stowe, Esquire of Watertown, State of South Dakota be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he

Tuesday, March 9th 1920, cont

On motion first made to t
Court in this behalf by Mr. H
Brown, it is ordered that E. E
son, Esquire of Bulloch, S
Virginia be admitted to prac
as an attorney and counsellor o
Court, and he was sworn accor

The State of Rhode
Island,
Complainant,
vs.
Mitchell Palmer,
Attorney General et
al.

29 Orig'l

The argu
of this ca
was cont
by Mr. A
Attorney
Division,
Mr. Sol
General,

for the defendants and conclu
by Mr. Herbert A. Rice for th
Complainant.)

George C. Hemenway
Appellant,
vs.
Thomas J. Boynton
United States Attorney
&c, et al.

696

This
was
by M
A. Kel
for th
appe
and
General

Mr. Assistant Attorney
sent for the appellee.

Tuesday, March 9th, 1920, continued.)

Kentucky Distilleries & Warehouse Company, Appellant,
vs.
752 W. V. Gregory, District Attorney, &c., et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Lewis Mayer for the appellant and continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Dawson for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Wednesday, March 10th 1920 —

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.
Frank R. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General King, it is ordered that Edward Gburtis, Esquire of Boston, State of Massachusetts and Daniel L. Morris, Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in

nesday, March 10th, 1920, continued.)

t is ordered that William S Hammers, Esquire) of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. Kenneth McKellar it is ordered that Urey Howard, Esquire) of Nashville, State of Tennessee be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. C. S. Mashill, it is ordered that John C. Willis, Esquire) of Memphis, State of Tennessee be admitted to practice) as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr N. S. Kenyon it is ordered that J. C. McCord, Esquire) of Mount Pleasant, and Paul B. Galer, Esquire) of Mt Pleasant State of Iowa, be admitted to practice) as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

Wednesday, March 10th 1920, contin

Edward A. Studd,
et al.,
Appellants,
2.31. vs.
Guardian Trust Com-
pany et al.

This c
was
Pursu
the 2
Rules,

Kentucky Distilleries &
Warehouse Company,
Appellant
1752 vs.
W. V. Gregory, District
Attorney &c., et al.

The ar
of This
was c
by Mr.
Assist
Attorn
Division

Mr. Solicitor General Kuhn for the
Appellees and concluded by Mr. M
Marshall Bullitt for the Appellan

Rederia Aktiebolaget
Atlantic,
(Petitioner)
171 vs.
Aktiesselskabet Korn-Og
Foderstof Kompagniet.

This c
was a
by Mr
Charl
Bisho
for the
Petition

by Mr. Roscoe H. Hupper for the re

Michael W. Bochmer
Petitioner,
191 vs.
Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

Wednesday, March 10th 1920, continued.)

The argument commenced by Mrs. E. C. Braudenburg for the petitioners.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

11

Thursday, March 11th 1920

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., it is ordered that R. L. Ralston, Esquire, of Kittanning, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Pierson it is ordered that Philip L. Miller, Es-

unsday, March 11th. 1929, continued.)

Mirous, Esquire), of San Diego, State of California be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On consideration first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles F. Consaul, it is ordered that James R. Jackie, Esquire, of Lynchburg, State of Virginia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. Lo. Allen, it is ordered that John A. Cunningham, Esquire, of San Antonio, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court. and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. A. Brickhouse, it is ordered that Charles A. Potter, Esquire, and James F. Price, Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia, and Philip S. McLean, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

Thursday, March 11th 1920

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James H. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., it is ordered that R. L. Ralston, Esquire, of Kittanning, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Pierson it is ordered that Philip L. Miller, Es-

(Tuesday, March 11th 1924, continued)

Mirou, Esquire), of San Diego, State of California be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On consideration first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles F. Poncau, it is ordered that James R. Jackie, Esquire, of Lynchburg, State of Virginia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. C. Allen, it is ordered that John A. Cunningham, Esquire, of San Antonio, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. A. Brickenstein, it is ordered that Charles A. Potter, Esquire, and James F. Pierce, Esquire of Washington District of Columbia, and Philip S. McLean, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

Thursday, March 11th 1920, cont

The Globe Works,
Appellant,
237 vs.
The United States.

Appeal
the Court
Claims

This cause came on to be he
on the transcript of the record f
the Court of Claims, and the
having been three times solemnly
by the Marshal to come in to
and prosecute its appeal, and
to appear, it is, thereupon, in
of the 16th Rule of this Court, a
the motion of Mr. Assistant At
General Davis, of counsel for
appellee, now here ordered an
judged by this Court, that this
be, and the same is hereby, dismi
and that this cause be, and the
is hereby remanded to the said
of Claims to be proceeded in ac
to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice W

Michael W. Bochmer,
Petitioner
191 vs.
Pennsylvania Rail-
road Company.

Rehearing
of this
was con
by Mr.
Beaudet
for the

(Tuesday, March 11th 1920, continued)

respondent and concluded by Mr. Thomas A. Sullivan for the petitioner.

Sue Erskine Newman, Administratrix, &c., et al., Appellants,
vs.
85 Ida M. Moyers et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Freeson for the appellants and by Mr. Charles F. Consaul for the appellees.

C. C. Calhoun, Petitioner
vs.
294 Bland Massie.

This cause was argued by Mr. Charles F. Consaul for the petitioner and by Mr. James R. Castle for the respondent.

Coleman J. Ward et al., Petitioners
vs.
224 The Board of County Commissioners of Love County, Oklahoma.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Embeson Bennett and

Thursday, March 11th 1920, continued.

No appearance was entered for the respondent.

McClay Engineering Company, Appellant,
v.
The United States

227

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. George A. King for the Appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Friday, March 12th 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry M. Goldfogle it is ordered that Myer J. Stein, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Merrill N. Moore, it is ordered that Charles M. McCabe,

Indiana) be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., it is ordered that Frank P. McClintermoth Esquire, of Jersey City State of New Jersey and George T. Harrell Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. Hiram A. Wood it is ordered that W. B. Council Esquire, of Hickory, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Ada C. Mongrain,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs. 242
W. N. Aaron et al.,

This cause was passed per stipulation of counsel.

(Friday, March 12th 1920, continued)

McCoy Engineering Company, Appellant,
vs.
227. The United States

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. George A. King for the appellant by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Davis for the appellee and concluded by Mr. George A. King for the appellant.

C. C. Taft Company, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
230 The State of Iowa.

This cause was argued by Mr. F. C. Davidson for the defendant in error and submitted by Mr. Fred P. Starr, and Mr. Robert M. Haines for the plaintiff in error.

George E. Bunnell, Appellant,
vs.
228 The United States

This cause was argued by Mr. George A. King for the appellant and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Davis for the appellee

The United States, Appellant,
vs.
233

Friday, March 12th 1920, continued.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Davis for the appellant and by Mr. Jackson H. Ralston for the appellee.

James P. Parsons, Plaintiff in Error, vs. William H. Moore et al. Death of Fred O. Peak, one of the defendants in error, herein,

236

suggested, and appearance of Bell S. Peak, individually and as executrix &c, of Fred O. Peak, deceased, as a party defendant in error herein filed and entered on motion of Mr. Herbert P. Whitney for the defendants in error.

This cause was argued by Mr. Herbert P. Whitney for the defendants in error and submitted by Mr. Charles H. Carusi for the plaintiff in error.

E. W. Bliss Company, Appellant, vs. The United States.

240

The argument of this cause

Friday, March 12th, 1920, continued.)

was commenced by Mr Arthur C. Drasen for the defendant.)

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at twelve o'clock.)

Monday, March 15th, 1920

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice;
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General King it is ordered that N. P. Adair, Esquire, and P. N. Odom, Esquire, of Jacksonville, State of Florida; Harold Williams, Jr., Esquire of Boston, State of Massachusetts, and John D. Hughes, Esquire of Boston State of Massachusetts be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

Monday, March 15th 1920, continued.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. G. Carroll Todd, it is ordered that Frank Ford Warren, Jr., Esquire, of New York City, and Barnes Gillespie, Esquire, and George Campbell Peery, Esquire, of Pazewell, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. N.S. Knight it is ordered that Charles J. Byron, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Deal, it is ordered that Robert A. Kaftan, Esquire, of Green Bay, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Benjamin Mecow, it is ordered that

Monday, March 15th 1920, continued.

State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

147. Panama Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Joseph T. Dobbins. In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Canal Zone.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis

Monday, March 15th 1920, continued.

George A. Cole, Ed Malley, Gilbert Co. Ross et al., Petitioners vs. Joseph Ralph. 172 & 173

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs, and that the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the District of Nevada in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter

Monday, March 15th 1920, continued.

312 John M. Pananowicz, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The People of the State of Illinois. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

262 Virginia and West Virginia Coal Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Green Charles. In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and on motion

Monday, March 15th 1920, continued.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

230 C. C. P. & F. Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Iowa. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

236 James P. Parsons, Plaintiff in Error, vs. William H. Moore Edmund

Monday, March 15th 1920, continued:

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The State of New Jersey,

vs.

A. Mitchell Palmer, Attorney General and Daniel C. Roper, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Orig'l

Application for leave to file bill granted and process ordered; but should the Attorney General be advised to move to dismiss, a motion to advance the hearing on the motion to dismiss to the earliest practicable day will be entertained, in order that the issues arising from such motion may be considered in connection with the controversies now under advisement as

the State of Rhode Island and other causes involving kindred questions which are now also under submission.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

328 Kansas City, Plaintiff in Error vs. Public Service Commission of Missouri et al.

On consideration of the motion to retax costs in this case, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

534 Leslie C. Stallings, Appellant, vs. Maurice Splain, U.S. Marshal, in and for the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 12th next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Chicago, Milwaukee and St Paul Railway Company, Petitioners,
628 vs.
McCaull Dinsmore Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 12th next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Walter F. Britton, as Trustee in bankruptcy of P. B. Mann Anchor Company, bankrupt, Petitioner,
709 vs.
Union Investment Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against

Monday, March 15th, 1920, (continued)

this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

725 Walter M. Reader, et al. Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of, as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

739 Atchafalaya Land Company, Petitioner, vs. Paul Caillouet, Auditor, Fred J. Grace, Register, and Board of Commissioners of

Monday, March 15th, 1920, continued.

Basin Levee Com'rs — Caney. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana and of the argument of counsel thereupon had in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Charles Kollman, Petitioner, vs. The United States — Orig'l. On consideration of the application to extend time for filing a certified copy of the transcript of record in support of the petition for a writ of certiorari heretofore lodged with the Clerk of this Court within the time prescribed by law,

It is now here ordered by this Court, that the said application be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The State of New Jersey, Complainant,
-Orig'l- vs.
A. Mitchell Palmer, Attorney General et al.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Kuiz, leave is granted to file motion to dismiss in this cause, and cause assigned for hearing on Monday, the 29th instant.

Christian Feigenspan, Appellant,
788. vs.
Joseph L. Bodine, U.S. Attorney, etc et al.

On motion of Mr Solicitor General Kuiz it is ordered that this cause be advanced for hearing on Monday, the 29th instant.

Hiram A. Sawyer, as U.S. Attorney &c, et al. Appellants,
794 vs.
Manitowoc Product Company.

On motion of Mr Solicitor General Kuiz it is ordered that this cause be advanced for hearing on Monday, the 29th instant.

Monday, March 15th, 1920, continued.

Daniel O'Connell et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
221 The United States of America.

The motion for a writ of certiorari on suggestion of diminution of the record herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the defendant in error.

The United States of America, Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
293 A. L. Swiftke.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King, of counsel for the Plaintiffs in Error and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, March 15th, 1920, continued.

Carl A. Richardson, as Trustee, &c., Petitioner, vs. The German Bank of the City of New York. (No. 770) The Petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Carroll G. Walter for the Petitioner and by Mr. Bernard Hershkopf for the respondent.

Porto Rico Railway Light & Power Company, vs. Adalberto Diaz Mor. (No. 728) The Petition for writ of certiorari to bring up entire record and cause, and motion to advance was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Carroll G. Walter for the Porto Rico Railway Light & Power Company.

Western Fuel Company, vs. Antone Garcia, as administrator, &c., (No. 689.) The Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to bring up the entire record and cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr.

Monday, March 15th 1920, continued.

J. J. Dillon,
Appellant,
731 vs.
R. M. Glose, deputy
collector &c.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr Leisi Cooke in behalf of Mr. Theodore A. Bell for the appellant.

J. LeRoy Nickel et al,
as Trustees &c, et al,
Plaintiffs in Error,
775 Geo A. Cole, vs. as Controller of
the State of Nevada;
and
Nellie Miller Nickel et al,
as Trustees &c,
Plaintiffs in Error,
776 v
The State of Nevada.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward D. Meadwell and Mr. Azro E. Chaney for the plaintiffs in error in support of the petition and by Mr. William C. Prentiss for the defendants in error in opposition thereto.

Monday, March 15th, 1920, continued.

William G. Strack,
Appellant,
795 vs.
Lincoln Safe Deposit
Company et al.,

(The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Paul Fesch in behalf of Mr. Joseph S. Auerbach and Mr. Charles N. Bullis, for the appellant.)

The State of Rhode
Island,
Complainant,
29 Orig'l vs.
A. Mitchell Palmer,
Attorney General et al.

(Leave granted to file brief of Aaron A. Ferris as amicus curiae therein, on motion of Mr. E. N. Scott in that behalf.)

E. J. Frazier,
Petitioner,
716 vs.
The State of Oregon.

(The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court in this behalf by Mr. Enos S. Stockbridge for the petitioner and by Mr. George M. Brown for the respondent.)

Alfred J. Kobbelman et al., &c.,
Petitioners
vs.
723 A. Mitchell Palmer, Alien Property Custodian.

The p
for
of c
here
subm
to th
pursu
of the

by Mr. Edward M. Colie, for the P
and by Mr. Assistant Attorney Gen
Spellacy for the respondent.

Carl Goepel et al.,
Partners &c.,
Petitioners
724 vs.
A. Mitchell Palmer,
Alien Property Custo-
dian.

The Peti
for a w
of certio
herein
submitte
to the C
pursuan
of the C

by Mr. Ruby R. Vale for the Petit
and by Mr. Assistant Attorney G
Spellacy for the respondent.

Louis De F. Munger,
Petitioner,
735 vs.
Firestone Tire & Rubber
Company.

The Peti
for a w
of certio
herein
submitte
to the co

Monday, March 15th, 1920, continued.

A. Redding for the petitioner and by Mr. Charles Neave, Mr. William G. McKnight and Mr. Edward Rector for the respondent.

736 Louis W. D. Munger, Petitioner, vs. The B. F. Goodrich Company. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William A. Redding for the petitioner and by Mr. William G. McKnight, Mr. Charles Neave, and Mr. Edward Rector for the respondent.

747 American Ore Reclamation Company, Petitioner, vs. Wright and Lloyd Sintering Co., Ind. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry B. Gay for the petitioner and by Mr. Otto C. Wierum for the respondent.

757. Empire Fuel Coal Company, Petitioner, vs. J. E. Lyons.

The Pet
for a
of cert
herein
submit
the con

tion of the Court by Mr. Arthur Dayton, Mr. Malvern G. Dorsey, Mr. Hank E. Wood for the P and by Mr. Murray Season q for the respondent.

785 S. J. Lindsey, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.

The Peti
for a
of certi
herein
submit
the cons

tion of the Court by Mr. A. Johnst Ackiss for the Petitioner.

784 The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company, Petitioner vs. Industrial Commission of the State of Illinois &c.

The Petition for a writ of

Monday, March 15th 1920, continued

consideration of the Court by Mr. Gardiner Lathrop, for the Petitioner and by Mr. Leo L. Monahon for the respondent.

E. N. Blues Company, Appellant, vs. The United States. 240

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Arthur C. Fraser for the Appellant by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Davis and Mr. Daniel L. Morris for the Appellee and concluded by Mr. Arthur C. Fraser for the Appellant.

Ex Parte In the Matter of Walter Peterson as receiver, &c. 28 Orig.

Petitioner.

This cause was argued on the return to the Rule to Show Cause by Mr Abram J. Rose for the Petitioner and by Mr. George Zabriskie for the respondent.

Monday, March 15th 1920, cont

247 The Kansas City Nut and Bolt Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Kansas City Light and Power Company. W. Lucas for the defendant in er

This cause was by M Rus for the Plaint in er by M

X Submitted 1737 248 The People of the State of New York ex rel. Troy Union Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. G. Bank Mealy et al.

This cause Passed fu to the 26th

1

Proclamation being made, the Co is adjourned until tomorrow a twelve o'clock (.)

Tuesday, March 16th 1920

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John M. Woolsey it is ordered that H. Bruce Campbell of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward N. Vose it is ordered that James H. Bridgers, Esquire of Henderson, State of North Carolina be admitted to practice as an

he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Neale, it is ordered that Harry M. Guterman, Esquire of Boston, State of Massachusetts and Jesse N. Evans, Esquire, of Reno, Nevada, State of Nevada be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel E. Sway ze it is ordered that Reginald Heber Smith, Esquire of Boston State of Massachusetts be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S.H.S. Knight, it is ordered that Howard Garfield Cook, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Tuesday, March 16th 1920, continued.

256 Samuel M. Scott et al, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Ida B. M. Booth. — This cause was passed pursuant to the 26th Rule per Stipulation of counsel;

258 Louis B. Nagler, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America. — This cause was passed pursuant to the 26th Rule per Stipulation of counsel.

214 The United States, Appellant, vs. Atlantic Dredging Company, U. B. Brooks, Agent. — This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Davis for the appellant and by Mr. William L. Marbury for the appellees.

248 The Seaboard Air Line Railway, Appellant, vs. The United States — This cause was argued by Mr. Benjamin Cooley for the appellant and by

Tuesday, March 16th 1920, continued.

for the appellee.

Piedmont and Georges Creek Coal Company, Petitioner,
vs.
Seaboard Fisheries Company, Claimant, &c.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. John M. Woolsey for the petitioner and continued by Mr. Philip L. Miller for the respondent.

D 11

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Wednesday March 17th 1920

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.

Mark K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James H. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General King, it is ordered that Harry C. Cox, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas

Gault, Esquire, of Watertown, State of South Dakota be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. O. Adcock, it is ordered that Arch Williams, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. J. Rogers, it is ordered that Percy A. Atherton, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

George C. Butler Appellant
vs.
The United States

This cause was passed pursuant to the 26th Rule per Stipulation of counsel.

211

102

260

213

dnesday, March 17th 1920, continued.

Piedmont and Georges Creek Coal Company, Petitioner,
vs.
Seaboard Fisheries Company, claimant &c.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Philip L. Miller for the respondent and concluded by Mr. John M. Woolsey for the Petitioner.

The Cuyahoga River Power Company, Appellant,
vs.
The Northern Ohio Traction & Light Company et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Carroll E. Walter for the appellant and by Mr. John E. Mordy and Mr. J. S. Clark for the appellees.

John M. Simpson et al, as surviving executors &c., Appellants,
vs.
The United States.

Death of Thomas Thacher suggested

the name of John M. Simpson as surviving executor &c, on motion of Mr. Thomas Miller Kemp for the appellants.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Thomas Miller Kemp for the appellants and continued by Mr. Solicitor General Craig for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned

Thursday, March 18th 1920.—

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D White Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C McReynolds.
Louis D Brandeis
John H Clarke
(Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal).
(James D. Maher, Clerk.)

Associate Justices.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. J. Rogers, it is ordered that George Holden Pinkham Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

601	George S. Hawke, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Harvey C. Smith, as Secretary of State of Ohio.	Leave granted to file brief as amicus curiae on motion of Mr. George Wharton Pepper in behalf of the National Woman's Party.
213	John M. Simpson &c., Appellant, vs. The United States.	The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Solicitor General King for the appellee and concluded by Mr. Thomas Mills Day for the appellant.
243	The United States Appellant, vs. The Omaha Tribe of Indians; and	This cause was argued by Mr. Charles H. Merillat for the Omaha Tribe of Indians and by Mr.
244	The Omaha Tribe of Indians Appellant, vs. The United States	

day, March 18th 1920, continued.

torney General Davis for the
ited States.

South Covington
Cincinnati Street
lway Company
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Commonwealth
Kentucky;
and
Cincinnati, Cov-
on & Erlanger
way Company
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Commonwealth
Kentucky.

The argument of these causes was
menced by Mr. Alfred P. Coss-
for the Plaintiffs in error and
inued by Mr. Stephens L. Blakely
the defendant in error.

clamation being made the Court
djourned until tomorrow at
e o'clock.

Friday, March 19th 1920

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna.
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green Esquire Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court this Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. B. Ames it is ordered that Ed. S. Vaught, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. M. Hawk, Jr. it is ordered that John S. Strahorn, Esquire, of Annapolis, Maryland

Friday, March 19th, 1920, continued.

and J. Edward Cole, Esquire), of Norfolk, State of Virginia be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George M. Sutton, it is ordered that LeRoy Reeves, Esquire, of Johnson City, State of Tennessee be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas J. Connolly, it is ordered that Paul J. Connolly, Esquire) of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Stanley C. Willis, it is ordered that Saul E. Klein, Esquire, and William A. Hughes, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio be admitted to practice

Court and they were sworn a
ing up.

On motion Irish made to
Court on this behalf by Mr. R
Stricklaud it is ordered that
R. Thompson, Esquire, of Newk
be admitted to practice a
attorney and counsellor of this
and he was sworn accordi

E. B Howard, State Auditor of the State of Oklahoma
Appellant;

267. vs.

N. V. Foster and John N Brennan, co-partners doing business as Foster & Brennan,

Appe
the hol
Court
United
for the
ern h
of Ok

It appearing to the Court Th
motion of counsel for the app
to dismiss this appeal has b
filed,

Therefore in pursuance of s
motion it is now here ordered, a
judged and decreed by this Court
this appeal be, and the same i
hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice

Friday, March 19th 1920, continued.

Bartholomew Sullivan et al.,
Appellants,
268 vs.
Jane Kidd.

This cause was passed pursuant to the 26th Rule, per Stipulation of Counsel.

South Covington & Cincinnati Street Railway Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
252 vs.
The Commonwealth of Kentucky;
and
The Cincinnati, Covington & Erlanger Railway Company,
Plaintiff in Error
253 vs.
The Commonwealth of Kentucky.

The argument of these causes was continued by Mr. Stephens L. Blakely for the defendant in error and concluded by Mr. Alfred C. Cassatt for the plaintiff in Error.

New Orleans Land Company,

Friday, March 19th 1920, contin

257 Willis J Roussel, Administrator &c, et al. vs. This cau was arg by Mr L Louque The Plaint in error and submitted by Mr Liais Renaius Wade for the def dant in error.

259 O & S Job & Co. Inc. vs. Oneida Navigation Corporation, Claimant &c, Appellant. This ca was arg by Mr M Butler, Bett, J The a and sub to the consideration of the Court on printed briefs by Mr. Peter Sharl The appellee.

261 Edward O. Mason, as he is Trustee &c, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Thomas J. Shannon et al. This caus was arg by Mr A Williams for the Plaintiff in error and by Mr. John T. Hughes, for the de fendants in error.

Friday, March 19th 1920, continued.)

D.S. Royster Guano Company (Plaintiff in Error)
vs.
The Commonwealth of Virginia

165

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Caldwell as counsel for the Plaintiff in Error and continued by Mr. J. L. Hauk, Jr., for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday Next at twelve o'clock.

Monday, March 22d 1920

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carlos Bee, it is ordered that William A. Russell, Esquire, of San Antonio, Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr Solicitor General Rice it is ordered that

Monday, March 22d 1920, (continued.)

Marcus Borchardt, Esquire) of Washington, District of Columbia, Jesse J. Webb Esquire), of Galveston, State of Texas, and John A. Cain, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph Walsh it is ordered that Frederick M. Hadlinger Esquire, of Cambridge, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. M. P. Kinkaid it is ordered that Edward P. McDermott Esquire, of Kearney, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Levi Cooke it

Esquire of New York City and
Charles J. Starkey Jr., Esq
of Ashtabula State of Ohio,
admitted to practice as attorne
and counsellors of this Court a
they were sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the
Court in this behalf by Mr. C
G. Grago, it is ordered that John H
Weise, Esquire of Harrisburg, Stat
Pennsylvania, be admitted to prac
as an attorney and counsellor of th
Court, and he was sworn accord

On motion first made to the Co
in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Ri
it is ordered that John H. Cox,
quire, of Washington District o
Columbia be admitted to prac
as an attorney and counsellor
this Court, and he was sworn a
cordingly.

On motion first made to the C
in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn
Esterline, it is ordered that Wal
St. Jacobs, Esquire, of Chicago, St
of Illinois, be admitted to prac
as an attorney and counsellor of this
Court, and he was sworn accor

Monday, March 22d 1920, continued.

29

The Oklahoma Operating Company, Appellant, vs. J. E. Love, W. H. Murphy and Campbell Russell, composing the Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Oklahoma Gin Com-
pany,
Plaintiff in Error,
32. vs.
The State of Oklahoma.

In err
the Su
Court
the St
of Ok
homa

This cause came on to be hear
on the transcript of the record fr
the Supreme Court of the State o
Oklahoma and was argued by
counsel.

On consideration whereof, t
ordered and adjudged by this C
that the judgment of the said Su
Court, in this cause be, and the
is hereby, reversed with costs; and
this cause be, and the same is
hereby, remanded to the said Su
Court for further proceedings no
consistent with the opinion of this
Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Wh

Hiawassee River
Power Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
208 vs.
Carolina Tennessee
Power Company.

In error to
the Supreme
Court of t
State of
North Car

Monday, March 22d 1920, continued.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Roderia Kiebolaget Atlanten, Petitioner, vs. Aktiesel Kabet Kom-Og Fodestof. Kompagniet. 171

On writ of certiorari to the United States for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause be,

with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes

370

J. Hartley Manners, Petitioner,
vs.
Oliver Morosco.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion

Monday, March 22d 1920, continued.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Clarke
Mr. Justice Pitney.

The Union Pacific Coal Company, Petitioner,
vs.
Mark A. Skinner, Collector of Internal Revenue.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

111

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Colorado.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, March 22d 1920, continued.

227. McClaup Engineering Company, Appellant, vs. The United States. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, the Court being equally divided in opinion, It is now hereby ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration of this case).

241 The Kansas City Nut & Bolt Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Kansas City Light & Power Company. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

Monday, March 22d 1920, continued.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

257 New Orleans Land Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Willis J. Roussel, Administrator et al. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Edward C. Mason, as
he is Trustee in Bank-
ruptcy of the Shepard
Manufacturing Com-
pany, Inc.
Plaintiff in Error,

261

vs.

Thomas J. Shannon, The
Shepard Manufacturing
Company, Inc., and
Walter L. Shepard.

In error to the Superior Court
the State of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be he
on the transcript of the record from
the Superior Court of the State of
Massachusetts and was argu
by counsel.

On consideration whereof,
is now here ordered and adjudg
by this Court that the writ of err
in this cause be, and the same
hereby, dismissed for the want
jurisdiction.)

Per Mr. Chief Justice W

The United States of
America and Inter-
State Commerce Com-
mission, Appellants

Monday, March 22d 1920, continued.)

541 vs.

Alaska Steamship Company, Central of Georgia Railway Company, Clyde Steamship Company et al.

Counsel are requested to file briefs concerning the effect upon the issues herein involved resulting from the act of Congress terminating the Federal Control of railroads, and amending the Act to regulate commerce in certain particulars, approved February 28th 1920.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, March 22d 1920, co

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

No. 7, Original.—October Term, 1919.

The State of Arkansas, Complainant,
vs.
The State of Mississippi. } In Equity.

THIS CAUSE came on to be heard by this Court on the motions and suggestions of counsel for the respective parties for the appointment of a commission to run, locate, and designate the boundary line between the States of Arkansas and Mississippi as indicated in the opinion of this Court delivered on the 19th day of May, 1919, and thereupon and on consideration thereof, It is ordered, adjudged and decreed as follows, viz:

1. The true boundary line between the States of Arkansas and Mississippi, at the places in controversy in this cause, aside from the question of the avulsion of 1848, hereinafter mentioned, is the middle of the main channel of navigation of the Mississippi River as it existed at the Treaty of Peace concluded between the United States and Great Britain in 1783, subject to such changes as have occurred since that time through natural and gradual processes.

2. By the avulsion which occurred about 1848, and which resulted in the formation of a new main channel of navigation, the boundary line between said States was unaffected, and remained in the middle of the former main channel of navigation as above defined.

3. The boundary line between the said States should now be located along that portion of said river, or the bed of said river, which ceased to be the main channel of navigation as the result

of said avulsion, according to the middle of the main navigable channel as it existed immediately prior to the time of said avulsion.

4. A commission consisting of Samuel S. Gannett, Washington, D. C., Charles H. Miller, Little Rock, Arkansas, and Stevenson Archer, Jr., Greenville, Mississippi, competent persons, is here and now appointed by the Court, to run, locate and designate the boundary line between said States along that portion of said river which ceased to be a part of the main navigable channel of said river as the result of said avulsion, in accordance with the above principles: Commencing at a point in said Mississippi River about one mile southwest from Friars Point, Coahoma County, Mississippi, where the main navigable channel of said river, prior to said avulsion, turned and flowed in a southerly direction, and thence following along the middle of the former main channel of navigation by its several courses and windings to the end of said portion of said Mississippi River which ceased to be a part of the main channel of navigation of said river as the result of said avulsion of 1848.

5. In the event the said Commission cannot now locate with reasonable certainty the line of the river as it ran immediately before the avulsion of 1848, it shall report the nature and extent of the erosions, accretions and changes that occurred in the old channel of navigation as the result of said avulsion, and in said report, if necessary to be made in obedience to this paragraph of the decree, said Commission shall give its findings of fact and the evidence on which same are based.

6. Before entering upon the discharge of their duties, each of said Commissioners shall be duly sworn to perform faithfully, impartially and without prejudice or bias the duties hereinafter imposed; said oaths to be taken before the Clerk of this Court, or before the clerk of any District Court of the United States, or before an officer authorized by law to administer an oath in the State of Arkansas or Mississippi, and returned with their report. Said Commission is authorized and empowered to make examination of the territory in question, and to adopt all ordinary and legitimate methods in the ascertainment of the true location of the said boundary line; to examine and consider carefully the

Monday, March 22d 1920, continued

printed record in this cause and the opinion of this Court delivered on May 19, 1919, and to take such additional evidence under oath as may be necessary and authorized to enable said Commission to determine said boundary line, but such evidence shall be taken only upon notice to the parties with permission to attend by counsel and cross-examine the witnesses; to compel the attendance of witnesses and require them to testify; and all evidence taken and all exceptions thereto and rulings thereon shall be preserved, certified and returned with the report of said Commissioners; and said Commission shall do all other matters necessary to enable it to discharge its duties and to obtain the end to be accomplished conformably to this decree.

7. It is further ordered that should any vacancy or vacancies occur in said Board of Commissioners by reason of death, refusal to act, or inability to perform the duties required by this decree, the Chief Justice of this Court is hereby authorized and empowered to appoint another commissioner or commissioners to supply such vacancy or vacancies, the Chief Justice acting upon such information in the premises as may be satisfactory to him.

8. It is further ordered that said Commissioners do proceed with all convenient dispatch to discharge their duties conformably to this decree, and they are authorized, if they deem it necessary, to request the co-operation and assistance of the State authorities of Arkansas and Mississippi, or either of those States, in the performance of the duties hereby imposed.

9. It is further ordered that the Clerk of this Court shall forward at once to the Governor of each of said States of Arkansas and Mississippi and to each of the Commissioners hereby appointed a copy of this decree and of the opinion of this Court delivered herein May 19, 1919, duly authenticated.

10. Said Commissioners shall make a report of their proceedings under this decree as soon as practicable on or before the first day of October, 1920, and shall return with their report an itemized statement of services performed and expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties.

11. All other matters are reserved until the coming in of said report, or until such time as matters pertaining to this cause shall be properly presented to this Court for its consideration.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

March 22, 1920.

Monday, March 22d 1920, continued.

Daniel O'Donnell et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The United States of America. On consideration of the motion for a writ of certiorari on suggestion of diminution of the record,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, without prejudice, the matter submitted with the suggestion to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

J. J. Killon, Appellant, vs. W. W. Gloss, Deputy Collector of Internal Revenue. On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby denied, but leave is granted counsel to file briefs in the case assigned for the 29th instant as amici curiae.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

795 William L. Streit, Appellant, vs. Lincoln Safe Deposit Company and Daniel L. Porter.

On con
tion of
motion
advan
this ca
It is
here on

by the Court that said motion be, a
the same is hereby denied, but lea
granted counsel to file briefs as in th
cases assigned for the 29th. inst.
as amici curiae.

Per Mr. Chief Justice

694 United Mine Workers of America, et al, Petitioners vs. Coronado Coal Company et al).

It is ord
by the C
that the
their cons
tion of t
Petition
a writ o
certiorari in this cause be, and the
same is hereby postponed until the
hearing of the cause (No. 707) on the
writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company and Walker D. Hines, Director General

Monday, March 22d 1920, continued.

of Railroads,
Plaintiffs in Error,
733 vs.
H. A. P. Ault.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the writ of error.

See Mr. Chief Justice White.

J. LeRoy Nickel and Nellie Miller Nickel as Trustees etc., et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
775 and 776 vs.
George Alsole as State Comptroller of the State of Nevada;
and
Nellie Miller Nickel and J. LeRoy Nickel, as Trustees etc., et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The State of Nevada.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the Petition for writs of certiorari in these cases be,

Monday, March 22d 1920, ...

The hearing of the cases on the writ... ons.

Per Mr. Chief Justice W...

728 Porto Rico Railway Light and Power Company, vs. Adalberto Diaz Mor...

On consideration of the petition ... writ of ... orari ... to bring ...

entire record and cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice W...

728 Porto Rico Railway Light and Power Company, vs. Adalberto Diaz Mor...

On consideration of the motion ... motion ... advan... This ... It is ... here or... by the ...

here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and same is hereby granted, and cause, assigned for argument Monday, April 12th next aft... the cases theretofore assigned ... that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice ...

Monday, March 22nd 1920, continued.

689 Western Pub. Co. Pet'r vs. Antone Garcia, as Administrator of the Estate of Manuel Souza, deceased. On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to bring up the entire record and cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied. Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

716 E. J. Frasier Petitioner, vs. The State of Oregon. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon. On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied. Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Alfred J. Koppelmann and Edward M. Colie, Executors & Trustees under the last will of Adolphus Koppelmann,

Petitioners,

723

vs.

Mitchell Palmer, as Alien Property Custodian.

On [illegible] for [illegible] of [illegible] to the [illegible] of the [illegible] of the [illegible] Jers

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Chancery of the State of New Jersey, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now hereby ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Curiam. Chief Justice Wh

Carl Goepel et als., Partners as Schulz and Ruckgaber,

Petitioners

724

vs.

Mitchell Palmer, as Alien Property Custodian.

On petition [illegible] writ of certiorari to the Chancery of the State of New Jer

Monday, March 22d 1920, continued.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Chancery of the State of New Jersey, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court, that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Louis H. Del. Munger, Petitioner, vs. Firestone Tire and Rubber Company. 735. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

736 Louis Lee D. Munger, Petitioner, vs. The B. F. Goodrich Company. On Pe for wr certio to the States with C of Appeals for the Second Circ On consideration of the Pe for a writ of certiorari herein to t United States Circuit Court of A Seale for the Second Circuit a the argument of counsel thereupon aswell in support of as against same, it is now here ordered by Court that the said Petition be a the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice W

747 American Ore Reclamation Company, Petitioner vs. Wright & Lloyd Sintering Company et al. On Petit writ of certiorari United States Circuit Court of Ap for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the Petitio for a writ of certiorari herein to t United States Circuit Court of Ap for the Second Circuit and of the

Monday, March 22d 1920, Continued

argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

757 Empire Fuel Company, Petitioner, vs. J. E. Lyons. On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court, that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Earl A Richardson,
as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Frederick
P Foster,
Petitioner
770 vs.
The German Bank of
the City of New York.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and the argument of counsel thereupon as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition and the same is hereby den

Per Mr. Chief Justice W

S. J. Lucksay,
Petitioner
783 vs.
The United States
of America.

On Petition writ of ce to the Unit States Ci Court of Appeals for

Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the Pe for a writ of certiorari herein t United States Circuit Court o Appeals for the Fourth Circuit

Monday, March 22d 1920, continued.

of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Atchison Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company, Petitioner

784 vs.

Industrial Commission of the State of Illinois (Maria Kiley, Administratrix of the Estate of Roger Kiley, deceased).

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby

Monday, March 22d 1920, con

Per Mr. Chief Justice W

The Chief Justice announced t
The Court will take a recess, a
conclusion of the argument of t
cases especially assigned for th
29th instant to Monday April
next.

The United States
of America ex rel.,
Jennie Johnson
et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
291 vs.
Franklin K. Lane, Sec-
retary &c.,
and
The United States
ex rel Verdine R.
Hall,
Plaintiffs in Error,
349 vs.
Franklin K. Lane,
Secretary &c.

John Bar
Payne, &
ssist Secre
of the Int
Substitute
the Place
Franklin
Lane, Form
Secretary
thereof, on
tion of Mi
Solicitor G
Kuig for
defendant
Error.

Ernest B. Kane
Plaintiff in Error,
764 vs.
Charles L. Burrill.

Monday, March 22d 1920, continued

The motion to advance herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Harold Hitchcock for the defendant in error.

811 E. A. Green et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Lynn J. Frazier Governor et al, &c., — The motion to advance this cause was submitted to consideration of the Court by Mr. L. Russell Alden in behalf of counsel.

479 The Houston & Texas Central Railroad Company, Petitioners, vs. The City of Ennis et al. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles A. Bates in behalf of Mr. A. McGarwood, Mr. J. L. Gammon, and Mr. Jesse Andrews for the petitioner.

Monday March 22d 1920,

Southwestern Gas & Elec-
tric Company
Petitioner
774 vs.
The City of Shreve-
port.

The
for
of c
here
subp
to the
pede

of the Court by Mr. Max Pa
for the Petitioner

Coleman J. Ward
et als,
Petitioner
224 vs.
The Board of County
Commissioners of
Love County, Okla-
homa.

Leave
to fil
of ne
defe
moti
Mr. J
A. B
in be
of cou

Antonio Quesada
Chapa
Petitioner
745 vs.
The United States
of America.

The Pe
for a
of cer
herein
submit
to the C

ederation of the Court by Mr.
Chambers for the Petitioner and
Mr. Assistant Attorney General
Stewart and Mr. Henry S. Ridg
for the respondent.

Monday, March 22d 1920, continued

W. S. Bullock, Judge, etc et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
755 The State of Florida ex rel Railroad Commission of Florida.

The Petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George C Bedell for the Plaintiffs in error in support of the Petition.

The Central Elevator Company of Baltimore City,
Petitioner,
760 vs.
Naam Looze Vennoot Schap etc.,
and
The Pennsylvania Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
761 vs.
Naam Looze Vennoot Schap, etc.,

The Petition for writs of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr.

Carter for the petitioner and by Mr. Charles R. Hickox and Mr. John M. Mooney, for the respondent.

The Central Elevator Company of Baltimore City, Petitioner

762 vs.

Edwin H. Pyason, Master &c, and

The Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Petitioner,

763 vs.

Edwin H. Pyason, Master &c.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederic H. McKenney and Mr. Shirley Carter for the petitioners and by Mr. James R. Symmers for the respondent.

V. F. Miller, Petitioner

766 vs.

The United States of America

Monday, March 22nd 1920 continued.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A.M. Chambers, for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

773

France and Canada Steamship Corporation,
Petitioner
vs.
Konrad Storgard.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Bertrand L. Pettigrew for the petitioner and by Mr. Silas Blake Axtell for the respondent.

778

Alec Erickson,
Petitioner,
vs.
John A. Roebling's Sons Company of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Silas Blake Axtell, for the petitioner.

Monday, March 22d 1920, continued.

787 Karl Saudgren, et al., Petitioners vs Ulster Steamship Company, Ltd., Owners, &c. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. N. J. Maguire for the petitioners.

284 St Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs A. G. Rue, Jr., In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, 1st March 22d 1920, continued.

287. A. R. Elascock et als, Pltffs in Error
vs.
Ellis McDaniel et als, Minors, &c.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William B. Moore and Mr. George S. Ramsey for the Pltffs in error and by Mr. Grant Brennan and Mr. James H. Timms for the defendants in error, with leave to defendant in error to file additional brief by Friday next.

165 A. S. Royster Guano Company Pltff in Error,
vs.
The Commonwealth of Virginia,
defendant in Error

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. J. D. Hank, Jr., for the defendant in Error and concluded by Mr. Cadwallader J. Collins for the Pltff in Error.

263. B. T. Backus Pltff in Error,
vs.
Norfolk Southern Railroad Co.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. J. Edward

Monday, March 22d 1920, contin

Plaintiff in Error. The Court dec
to hear counsel for the defendan
in error.

Mary Williams a
creditor &c.,
Appellant,
vs
Dawson & Bradley,
Trustee &c.

This cau
was argu
by Mr. C
Lewis for
mus for
appellan
by Mr. P

V. Connolly, for the appellees.

The Penn Mutual,
Life Insurance
Company,
Petitioner,
vs
Ephraim Lederer,
Collector &c.

The argum
of this ca
was comm
by Mr Ge
Wharton
Pepper f
the Petit

Proclamation being made, the Cour
is adjourned until tomorrow at
twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, March 23d 1920

Pursuant to adjournment this Court met today, at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frances M. Phelps, it is ordered that Nelson J. Jewett, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solici-

Tuesday, March 23d 1920, continue

That Harlan F. Stone, Esquire, o
New York City, be admitted to pra
as an attorney and counsellor of
Court and he was sworn accor

On motion first made to the C
in this behalf by Mr. Dom K. M
Keown, it is ordered that Oran
Logan, Esquire, of Oklahoma (
State of Oklahoma be admitted t
practice as an attorney and c
sellor of this Court and he was
sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the C
in this behalf by Mr. Walter S. C
field it is ordered that Solomon
Wolff, Esquire, of New Orleans,
of Louisiana be admitted to pra
as an attorney and counsellor o
this Court and he was sworn a
cordingly.

On motion first made to the
Court in this behalf by Mr. John
Raker, it is ordered that Annette
Abbott Adams, of San Francisco, S
of California be admitted to pra
as an attorney and counsellor o
this Court, and he was sworn ac
ingly.

Tuesday, March 23d 1920, continued.

American Steel Foundries, Petitioner
vs.
James D. Newton, Commissioner of Patents.

On consideration of the petition of the Simplex Electric Heating Company for leave to file a printed brief herein and to participate through its counsel in the oral argument of this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

291

The United States of America ex rel Jennie Johnson et al, Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
John Barton Payne, Secretary of the Interior.

This cause was passed per stipulation of counsel.

The Penn Mutual Life Insurance Company, Petitioner,

Tuesday, March 23d 1920, continue

Ephraim Lederer,
Collector &c.

The argumen
This cause
continued b

George Wharton Pepper for the Pe
by Mr Assistant Attorney General
for the respondent and concluded by
George Wharton Pepper for the Pe

269

Thomas P. Kennup
as Administrator, etc.,
Petitioner,
vs.
Supreme Lodge of
the World, Loyal
Order of Moose;
and
Thomas P. Kennup
Administrator etc.,
Petitioner,
vs
Supreme Lodge of
the World, Loyal
order of Moose.

This c
was
by M
Starsh
The P
and Plaintiff
and
Mr.
Kenn
for T
respon
and
daub
error.

303

Chicago, Milwaukee
vs. St. Paul Railway
Company, et al.,
Petitioners
vs.
Des Moines Union
Railway Company

278

Tuesday, March 23d 1920, continued

and

The Minneapolis Union Railway Company, et al,

Petitioners

vs.

279 Chicago, Milwaukee & St Paul Railway Company.

Four hours were allowed for the argument of this cause on motion of Mr. Robert J. Carey, in behalf of Petitioners

Argument commenced by Mr. Robert J. Carey for the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Wednesday, March 24th, 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick W. Mallinger it is ordered that Harry A. K. McClain Esquire, and Philip R. Ammidon, Esquire of Cambridge, James H. Morson, Esquire, of Brookline, State of Massachusetts be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

dnesday, March 24th, 1920, Continued.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank J. Loesch, it is ordered that Theodore Schmidt, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Allan McCulloh, it is ordered that Campbell Locke, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Y.L. Parrish, it is ordered that Howard C. Burn, Esquire, of Des Moines, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Herman Nessels,
Appellant,
vs.

John H. McDonald, Commander of the United States Navy Yard, Brooklyn, New York.

appeal and continuing the a[illegible] in custody of the United States Marshal for the Eastern District of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. [illegible] H. Walsh and Mr. Thomas J. [illegible] for the appellant.

The m[illegible] for an order [illegible] tain[illegible] Statut[illegible] execu[illegible] appell[illegible]

296 Niles-Bement-Pond Company, Appellant, vs. Iron Molders' Union Local No. 68 et al.

This ca[illegible] was c[illegible] timed [illegible] stipul[illegible] of Coun[illegible]

298 Union Pacific Railroad Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. W. N. Jenkins et al.

~~This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska and was argued~~

In [illegible] the Sup[illegible] Court [illegible] the Stat[illegible] Nebras[illegible]

Wednesday March 24th 1920 continued.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Chicago Milwaukee & St Paul Railway Company et al
Petitioners
278 vs
Des Moines Union Railway Company et al.

and

Des Moines Union Railway Company et al
Petitioners
279 vs.
Chicago, Milwaukee and St Paul Railway Company et al.

Wednesday March 24th 1920, con

continued by Mr. Robert J. C
for the Chicago, Milwaukee a
St Paul Railway Co., et al.; by
J. L. Parish and Mr. Frederick
Lehmann for the Mourns Unit
Railway Co, et al; and concl
by Mr. Burton, Hanson for
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul
way Co, et al.

Emily M. Maguire
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
William H. P. Hefty, Tax
Commissioner &c.
Plaintiff in Error, and by Mr. Wi
Harold Ritchcock for the defen
in Error.

250

This c
was c
by M
Richar
N. Ste
for Th

Proclamation being made, the C
is adjourned until tomorrow a
twelve o'clock.

(continued.)

Thursday, March 25th, 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Stephen G. Porter, it is ordered that Charles Alvin Jones, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. L.

Lee Wallace, Esquire, of Kittanning, State of Pennsylvania be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

288 C. B. Munday et al, Plaintiffs in error vs. Wisconsin Trust Company, et al

Death of Frederick Robenson, one of the defendants in error herein, suggested, and appearance of Farmers Loan & Trust Company, Executor of Frederick Robinson deceased, as a party defendant in error herein filed and entered on motion of Mr. W. E. Black in that behalf.

282 The Metropolitan West Side Elevated Railway Company et al, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Maclay Hoyne, States Attorney &c., et al. and Metropolitan West Side Elevated Railway Company et al.

283

288

289.

uesday, March 25th 1920, continued

Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The Sanitary District
of Chicago et al.

The argument
of these cases
was commenced
by Mr. Frank
J Loesch for
the plaintiffs in error continued by
Mr. Edmund H. Adcock for the de-
fendants in error in No. 282, and
concluded by Mr. P. J. Schofield
for the plaintiffs in error and sub-
mitted by Mr. C. Arch Williams for
the defendants in error in No. 283.

P. B. Munday, Trustee
et al,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Wisconsin Trust Com-
pany et al,

This cause
was argued
by Mr.
William E.
Black for
defendants
in error

ud submitted to the consideration of
he Court by Mr. Hamilton, Moses and
Arthur Bagley
or the plaintiffs in error.

George R. Broadwell
Petitioner,
vs.
he Board of County
ommissioners of
arter County

Thursday, March 25th, 1920, con

This cause was submitte
consideration of the Court b
George P. Glaze for the Petitio
by Mr George B. Rittenhouse, M
ton A. Galbraith, Mr. P. J. McC
Mr. J. A. Bass for the respo

295 E. M. Blanchett
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The State of New
Mexico.

This
was
to the
pellan
the Bo
Mr. C

Renehan for the Plaintiff in
leave to counsel for the defend
error to file brief hereafter.

297 Queen Land Title
Company et al,
Appellants,
vs.
Kings County Trust
Company, et al.

This ca
argume
Mr. M
E. Cook
The a
and by
George

were for the appellees.

300 Fidelity Title & Trust
Company, ancillary
administrator &c,
Petitioner
vs

Thursday, March 25th 1920, continued

The Dubois Electric Company.

Alvin Jones for the Petitioners.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Charles

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Friday, March 26th 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph R. McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices

Frank K. Gross, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion duly made to the Court in this behalf by Mr Frank E. Hoeymes it is ordered that Percy N. Grose, Esquire of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

795

On motion duly made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William G. Hosler, it is ordered that

Friday, March 26th 1920, continued

Ralph H. Jackman, Esquire of Madison, State of Wisconsin be, admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. M. Kirby it is ordered that John J. Dunaher, Esquire, of Ashdown, State of Arkansas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Philip Campbell, it is ordered that H. N. Lucas, Esquire, of Claremore, State of Oklahoma be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

William G. Strut, Appellant,
vs.
Lincoln Safe Deposit Company and Daniel L.

The Second motion to advance this cause was submitted, to the considera- tion of the

Paul E. Leeds, in behalf of Mr
Joseph S. Auerbach and Mr. C
W. Rittle for the appellant.

Fidelity Title & Trust
Company, &c.,
Petitioners,
300 vs.
The Old Boris Electric
Company

and concluded by Mr. W. C. Mit
for the respondent.

The Pennsylvania Rail-
road Company,
Petitioner,
301 vs
Kittanning Iron and
Steel Manufacturing
Company.

The arg
of this
was con
by Mr.
Charles
Alvin
for the
W. C. Mit

The arg
of this
was co
mence
Mr. M
Wolf
for the
titioner

tinued by Mr. R. L. Ralston for the
respondent and concluded by Mr
F. D. McKenney for the petitio

Proclamation being made the Court
adjourned until Monday next at
twelve o'clock.

Monday, March 29th 1920 ——

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph M. McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motions first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General King it is ordered that Hughes D. Spalding, Esquire, and Hamil MacDougald, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia; Robert E. Lee Murphy, Esquire, of Lexington, State of Kentucky, and Jacob O. Bollinger, Esquire, of Pelzer, State of South Carolina be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court

On motion first made to t
Court in this behalf by Mr. D
F McCraw, it is ordered that
Maximilian M. Stallman Esq
of East Orange; Jerome A. Co
ton Esquire of Newark, and E
F. Smith Esquire of Jersey C
State of New Jersey, be adm
to practice as attorneys and c
sellors of this Court, and they we
accordingly.

On motion first made to the
Court in this behalf by Mr. P
M. Jackman it is ordered th
M. St Austin Esquire, of Mil
State of Wisconsin be admitte
practice as an attorney and co
sellor of this Court and he was
accordingly.

On motion first made to the
in this behalf by Mr. Calvin O
Mulane, it is ordered that Ell
J. Stoddard, Esquire) of Detroit
State of Michigan be admitted
practice as an attorney and co
sellor of this Court and he wa
sworn accordingly.

Monday, March 29th 1920, continued.)

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. B. A. Robertson it is ordered that Arthur C. Wallace, Esquire, of Miami, State of Oklahoma be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Crain it is ordered that George Hewlett, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. S. Tyler, it is ordered that Charles Steere, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. M. R. Kirby it is ordered that Daniel

Illinois, and Harry P. Warner, Esquire of Fort Smith, State of Arkansas be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter M. Chandler it is ordered that Edward J. Kelly, Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward N. Pou it is ordered that Paul D. Oliver, Esquire, of Westfield State of New Jersey be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom D. McKeown it is ordered that Albert H. Bennett, Esquire of Miami and H. M. Thomas, Esquire of Quapaw

Weaver Sherman, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Burt H. Andrews, it is ordered that Roy Leon Bailey Esquire of Philadelphia State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James Wickersham, it is ordered that William H. Boswell, Esquire of Anchorage, Territory of Alaska, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Charles Glen Collins,
Appellant,
350 and 4351 vs.
Frank M. Miller,

The Eastern District of Louisiana,
and
Tom D. Carlisle, British Consul General
Appellant,
351 vs.
Charles Flenbollins.

This cause came on to be h
on the transcript of the record
the District Court of the Unit
States for the Eastern Distri
Louisiana on separate a
and was argued by counsel.

On consideration, whereof
now here ordered, adjudged an
decreed by this Court that th
appeals be, and the same a
hereby, dismissed for the want
jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Bra

Strathearn Steamship Company, Limited,
Petitioner
873 vs.
John Dillon
for the Fifth Circuit.

On w
certio
to the
State
cuit
of Ap

Monday, March 29th, 1920, (continued)

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Florida.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

391. J. M. Thompson Master and Claimant of the Steamship "Westmeath" &c.,

Petitioner,

vs.

Peter Lucas and Gustav Blixt.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard

the United States Circuit Cou
Appeals for the Second Circ
and was argued by counsel

On consideration whereof
is now here ordered and adj
by this Court that the judgment decree
of the said United States Cir
Court of Appeals in this cau
and the same is hereby affir
with costs; and that this cause
and the same is hereby remand
to the District Court of the Un
States for the Eastern District
New York.

Per Mr. Justice Da

Ernest B. Dane,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Charles L. Burrill.

764

On consi
tion of t
motion
advance
cause, i
now here ordered by the Court t
said motion be, and the same
is hereby granted, and the cau
assigned for argument on Mon
April 19th next after the case
be assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice

Monday, March 29th, 1920, continued.

E. A. Green & W. W. Voight
W. M. Christianson and
D. V. Woodworth,
Plaintiffs in Error,

81 vs.

Lynn J. Frazier Governor,
William Langer Attorney
General et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted and the cause assigned for argument on Monday April 19th next, after the cases this day re assigned for that day.

Per WM. Chief Justice White.

William G. Strutz,
Appellant,

795 vs.

Lincoln Safe Deposit
Company and Samuel
L. Porter.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted

Monday, March 29th 1920, continue

on Monday, April 19th next at 1
cases this day re-assigned for
that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice W

Herman Weissker,
Appellant.
vs.
John H. McDonald
Commandant of the
United States Navy
Yard Brooklyn,
N.Y.

813

On consi
tion of the
motion f
order m
taining t
States
pending
appeal
continuin

the appellant in the custody of the
United States Marshal for the E
ern District of New York pending
appeal.

It is now here ordered by the
Court that the said motion be,
the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice W

W. S. Bullock, Judge
of the Circuit Court
of the Fifth Judicial
Circuit of the State of
Florida and William
S. Hood, Trustee
Plaintiffs in Error,

755

Monday, March 29th, 1920, continued.

The State of Florida upon the relation of the Railroad Commissioners of the State of Florida

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause, be, and the same is hereby postponed until the hearing of the case on the writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Houston and Texas Central Railroad Company, Petitioner

vs.

#79 The City of Ennis et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Fifth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Fifth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court

same is hereby denied.
See Mr. Chief Justice White.

Antonio Cisneros Chapa
Petitioner,
vs.
7/45 The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.
See Mr. Chief Justice White.

Central Elevator Company of Baltimore City,
Petitioner,
760 vs.
Naam Looze Vennoot Schap Stoomschip Willem Van Hoek, Sr, a corporation, as owner &c.

761

Monday, March 29th 1920, continued.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Adam Looze, Vennoot Schaap, Steamship Willem Van Ulrich, Sr., a corporation, &c. owner, &c.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and the argument of counsel there-

as against the same it is now ordered by the Court that the s petition be, and the same is denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice W

762. Central Elevator Company, of Baltimore City, Maryland, Petitioner, vs. Edwin Alyson, Master of the Steamship "Westbeck Hall" &c.

On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice W

763 The Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Petitioner vs.

Monday, March 29th, 1920, continued.

of the Steamship "Wal-
beck" etc.

On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

766 V. F. Miller, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.

On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here

Petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

773 France and Canada Steamship Corporation, Petitioner, vs. Konrad Storgard. On Petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

774 Southwestern Gas & Electric Company, Petitioner, vs. City of Shreveport. On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

Monday, March 29th, 1920, continued.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

778 Alec Ericksson, Petitioner, vs. John A. Roebling's Sons Company of New York. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

787

Karl Saudgren et al.,
Petitioners,
vs.
Ulster Steamship Company, Limited, owner and claimant of the Steamship "Rathlin Head", et al.

for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court, that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby de

Per Mr. Chief Justice W

The Chief Justice announced at the close of the argument of cases specially assigned for to the Court will take a recess un Monday, April 19th next.

Order:

It is ordered by the Court cases heretofore assigned for argument on Monday, April

next viz: Nos. 508; 492; 683; 15 to 29 inclusive; 506; 566; 582; & 601. 534; 628 and 728 be reassigned for Monday, April 19th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

27 Orig. The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, vs. The State of Texas. (The motion for leave to intervene & file petition of intervention herein, and to submit motion for injunction, and receiver or receivers, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the United States. Statement as to motion submitted by Mr. C.M. Cureton for the defendant.)

788 Christian Feigenspan, a corporation, Appellant, vs. Joseph L. Bodine, United States Attorney &c., et al.; and Miriam A. Sawyer, as

Monday, March 29th 1920, continued.

794 &c., et al., Appellants, vs. Manitowoc Products Company. Leave granted to file brief as amicus curiae on motion of Mr. Wayne B. Wheeler in that behalf.

785 Shelley B. Hutchinson, Petitioner vs. William M. Stemp et al. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Mayo Atkinson for the petitioner and by Mr. N. Benton Lewis and Mr. Frederick Geller for the respondents.

769 Jesse C. Washburn et al., Petitioners, vs. E. M. Gilles &c. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. P. Michener and Mr. Henry S. Johnston and Mr. Horace Speed for the petitioners.

Monday, March 29th, 1920, continued.

	William J. Givens, Appellant,	The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John S. Strahorn for the appellant.
808.	vs.	
	Fred G. Zerbst, Warden, &c.	
	Elizabeth Kenney Gregg, Petitioner,	The petition for writs of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick W. Miller for the petitioners.
834	vs.	
	Francis P. Garvan, Alien Property Custodian; and	
	A. J. Kelly, Jr., et al., Trustees &c., Petitioners,	
835	vs.	
	Francis P. Garvan, Alien Property Custodian.	
	J. J. Dillon, Appellant,	The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the con-
731.	vs.	
	R. H. Glass, deputy collector &c.	

Monday, March 29th 1920, continued

the Court by Mr. Theodore A. Bell for the appellant.

30, Orig'l. The State of New Jersey, Complainant, vs. A. Mitchell Palmer, Attorney General, et als. — Leave granted to file brief as amicus curiae on motion of Mr. Alexander Lincoln in that behalf.

799. Christian Feigenspan et al., Petitioners vs. T. J. Donohoe et al. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James Hutchinson in behalf of Mr. John Rustgard for the petitioners and by Mr. Edmund Smith for the respondents.

837. St. Louis Brewing Association, Appellant, vs. George H. Moore, Collector &c. — This cause was advanced and submitted to the consideration of the

Monday, March 29th 1920, continued.

John T. Fitzsimmons and Mr. Edward C. Brown, for the appellant with leave to counsel for the appellees to file brief hereafter.

836

N. Snowden Marshall, as Receiver, &c., Petitioner, vs. The People of the State of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander Kuig in behalf of Mr. A.S. Gilbert and Mr. William J. Hughes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Courtland A. Johnson for the respondent.

385

Michael F. Mangan, Administrator, etc., vs. The United States.

The motion to remand this cause for additional findings of fact was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles F. Consaul, Mr. John S. Blair, and Miss Ida M. Moyer, for the appellant and by Mr. Solicitor General Kuig and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Davis for the appellee.

Monday, March 29th 1920, continued.

581 Mary L. Grue Conklin, Appellant; vs. George N. Conklin et al. — The suggestion of diminution of the record and motion for the a writ of certiorari was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mrs. Mary L. Grue Conklin pro se. (or Place on the Summary docket) The motion to reverse herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mrs. Mary L. Grue Conklin pro se in support of the motion and by Mr. William H. Barnet, Mr. C. Henry Cohen and Mr. Bryan Cummings for the appellee in opposition thereto.

423 Chicago and Northwestern Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error; vs. Herman Van de Zande. — The motion to dismiss or affirm herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert A. Kaftan for the defendant in error in support of the motion and by Mr. R. M. Van Hoeven for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Monday, March 29th, 1920, continued.

693 Benjamin Horowitz et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The United States of America. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John J. Fitzgerald and Mr. Elijah N. Poline for the plaintiffs in error in support of the petition and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart for the defendant in error in opposition thereto.

710 The Merchants' National Bank of Richmond, Virginia, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The City of Richmond. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Leigh R. Page for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition and by Mr. R. R. Pollard and Mr. George Wayne Anderson for the defendant in error, in opposition thereto.

Monday, March 29th 1920, continued.

737 Barber & Company, Inc., Petitioner vs. Steamship "Knutsford" Limited. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Roger English for the petitioner and by Mr. Charles R. Hickox and Mr. L. De Grove Potter for the respondent.

753 Arthur Bain, Petitioner vs. The United States of America. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. M. Dillman for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

758 Charles L. Bauder, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Geo. S.

Monday, March 29th 1920, continued.

Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart for the respondent.

759 Webb Jay et al., Petitioners, vs. Frederick Weinberg et al. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles S. Burton and Mr. George L. Wilkinson for the petitioners and by Mr. R. A. Parker for the respondent.

772 Muriel L. Rowe as Trustee, &c., Petitioner vs. James L. Brokaw et al. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Herman J. Westwood for the petitioner and by Mr. Grafton L. McGill and Mr. Francis S. Maguire for the respondent.

779 The United States Petitioner, vs.

780 The United States
Petitioner,
vs
The National Surety.

The petition for writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Spellacy for the petitioner.

804 New York Central Railroad Company etc.,
Petitioner
vs
John S. Howell et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Oscar R. Houston for the petitioner.

818 Lehigh Valley Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
vs
Frederick N. Howell et al., &c., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lindley M. Garrison, Mr. Edgar H. Boles, Mr. Richard N. Barrett and Mr. George S. Hobart for the

Monday, March 29th 1920, continued.

and by Mr. Frederick B. Caulfield for the respondents.

Lehigh Valley Railroad Company, Petitioner
vs.
819 to 830. Royal Indemnity Company et al.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Luidley M. Garrison, Mr. Edgar A. Boles, Mr. Richard N. Barrett & Mr. George S. Hobart for the petitioner and by Mr. Jeremiah A. Hoover, Mr. M. M. Stallman and Mr. Edwin P. Smith for the respondents.

National Surety Company, Appellant,
vs.
347. The United States of America for the use of American Sheet Metal Works et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

motion, it is now here ordered adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

347 National Surety Company, Appellant, vs. The United States of America for the use of American Sheet Metal Works et al.

On motion of counsel for the appellant, It is ordered that the Clerk issue the mandate in this cause.

30 Orig. The State of New Jersey, Complainant, vs. A. Mitchell Palmer, Attorney General et al.

This cause was argued on the motion to dismiss by Mr. Thomas F. McGrath for the Complainant and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Frierson for the defendants.

Christian Feigenspan a corporation, Appellant

Monday, March 29th 1920, continued

Joseph F. Bodine
United States
Attorney &c., et
al.

appellants.

The argument
of this cause
was commenced
by Mr. Elihu
Root for the

Proclamation being made, the Court
is adjourned until tomorrow at
twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, March 30th 1920

Pursuant to adjournment the
met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward W. White, Ch
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke

Frank R. Gunn, Esquire, Marshal

Proclamation being made the
is opened.

On motion duly made to th
in this behalf by Mr. Andrew
Montague) it is ordered that
Hall, Esquire of Richmond, Vi
of Virginia, be admitted to
as an attorney and counsell
this Court, and he was swor
accordingly.

On motion duly made to
Court in this behalf, by Mr. Fr
M. McCarthy, Esquire, of Ans

Tuesday, March 30th, 1920, continued.

to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hubert D. Fisher, it is ordered that Emil C. Rawitzer, Esquire, of Memphis, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Franklin Shaw et al,
Appellants,
65 vs.
Franklin K. Lane,
Secretary &c.,
and
Franklin K. Lane,
Secretary &c., et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
405 vs.
The United States ex
rel Allen L. Newton.

John Barton Payne, present Secretary of the Interior, substituted as party Appellee in No 65, and as one of the parties Plaintiff in error

Tuesday, March 30th, 1920, cont

Lane, former Secretary of the I
on motion of Mr. Solicitor Ge
King in that behalf.)

405 John Barton Payne,
Secretary &c., et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The United States of
America) ex rel Allen
L. Newton,

The m
to dism
or of
in this
cause
submi
to the
sidera

of the Court by Mr. F. H. Clemen
and Mr. Alexander Britton, for
defendant in error in support
the motion and by Mr Assistant
Attorney General Nebeker for th
Plaintiffs in error in opposition the

788. Christian Feigenspan,
a corporation
Appellant,
vs.
Joseph L. Bodine, U.S.
Attorney &c.

Leave
grant
to file
as am
curia
motio
Mr.

Cooke in that behalf.

Christian Feigenspan,
a corporation,

Tuesday, March 30th, 1920, continued:

788 vs. Joseph L. Bodine, US Attorney &c. et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. William Guthrie for the appellant, by Mr. Solicitor General King for the appellees and concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Dawson, for the appellees.

Hiram A. Sawyer, as US Attorney &c, et al. Appellants, vs. 794 Manitowoc Products Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Dawson for the appellants; continued by Mr. Ralph W. Jackson for the appellee & concluded by Mr. Solicitor General King for the appellants.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Wednesday, March 31st 1920

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
James C. McReynolds, Associate Justice.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

...uant to adjournment the Court
...today at the Capitol.

Present:
...orable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes Associate
William R. Day Justices.
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
...K. Grace, Esquire, Marshal.
...ames H. Maher, Clerk.

...lamation ...being made, the Court
...ened.

...n motion ...isit made to the
... in this behalf by Mr. G.A.
...e it is ordered that Bertha M.
...nds of Detroit, State of Michigan,
...mitted to practice) as an attorney
...ounsellor of this Court, and she
...worn accordingly

Thursday, April 1st 1920, cont

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

No. 27, Original.—October Term, 1919.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
vs.
The State of Texas, Defendant.
The United States of America, Intervener.

In Equity

This cause coming on to be heard on the motion of the United States for leave to intervene herein for an injunction and for the appointment of a receiver, and on the responses made to such motion by the State of Oklahoma and the State of Texas, respectively, and the court being fully advised in the premises,

It is now considered, ordered and decreed as follows, until the further order of the court:

1. That said motion for leave to intervene herein be, and the same is hereby, granted.

2. The defendant, the State of Texas, her officers and agents, are hereby enjoined from selling any purported rights or making or issuing any grants, licenses or permits to any person, corporation or association covering or affecting any lands, or any part of the bed of Red River, lying north of the line of the south bank of such river as said south bank existed at the date of the ratification of the Treaty of 1819 between the United States and Spain, that is to say, on the twenty-second day of February, 1821, and between the One Hundredth degree of West Longitude and the southeastern corner of the State of Oklahoma.

3. Jacob M. Dickinson, Esquire, of Chicago, Illinois, is hereby appointed receiver of all the lands described in paragraph two of the said intervener's motion, to wit:

Bounded on the north by the mid channel of the Red River, as the mid channel is hereinafter defined; on the east by extension south of the west boundary line of Range 10 West between Town-

ship 4 South, Range 10 West, and Township 4 South, Range 11 West, in Cotton County, Oklahoma, crossing the remaining portion of said Red River and to the foot of the Texas bluffs as the South bank.—Thence up said River along the foot of the Texas bluffs as the South bank, through Ranges 11, 12, 13, and through Range 14 as follows: Commencing at a point on the east boundary line of Range 14 extended which point is 116.50 chains from the original meander corner of fractional Section 31, Township 4 South, Range 13 West and Section 36, Township 4 South, Range 14 West; thence

N. 79° 00′ W. 26.75 chs.
N. 71° 15′ W. 33.00 "
N. 75° 15′ W. 28.25 "
N. 86° 30′ W. 22.60 "
S. 85° 15′ W. 52.20 "
S. 85° 30′ W. 8.90 "
N. 82° 00′ W. 21.40 "
S. 82° 15′ W. 11.50 "
S. 71° 30′ W. 66.70 "
S. 69° 00′ W. 59.25 "

to a point on the present south bank of the Red River which is at the foot of the Texas bluff; thence along the line of the south bank and the foot of the Texas bluff

S. 64° 30′ W. 36.00 chs.
S. 64° 00′ W. 20.40 "
S. 51° 30′ W. 44.60 "
S. 65° 45′ W. 24.20 "
S. 71° 15′ W. 54.70 "

to a point on the present south bank of Red River at the foot of the Texas bluff at the intersection of a direct south extension of the west boundary of Range 14 West between fractional Section 7, Township 5 South, Range 14 West, and Section 12, Township 5 South, Range 15, which point is 57.43 chains from the original meander corner of said fractional sections.—

Thence continuing up said River along the foot of the Texas bluffs as the south bank, through Ranges 15 and 16 to the intersection of the west boundary line of Range 16 extended to the foot of the Texas bluffs.—

Thence north along said boundary line of Range 16 to mid channel of said River as the same meanders through the broad

Thursday, April 1st 1920, continued

stretch of sand which in some places extends to and is bounded by the bluffs on either side and in other places by the margin of the alluvial flood plain on either side, and which is covered with water at times of freshets and entirely devoid of flowing water during the annual dry seasons,—and of all machinery, fixtures, tools and other property of whatever kind or character now on said lands and used in connection with the extraction, storage, transportation, refining or disposal of the oil or gas products of said lands. And the said receiver is hereby authorized and empowered to take possession of said lands and property forthwith, to take all appropriate measures to conserve the oil and gas within such lands and to control all operations thereon for the production and disposal of such oil and gas.

4. Within thirty days after taking possession the receiver shall formulate and report to this court full and complete plans for prospecting such lands and developing and producing the oil and gas within the same; and until such report is made and acted upon by the court the receiver shall operate the existing oil and gas wells on said lands, or permit them to be operated by their respective claimants under his direction and supervision, or close down said wells if he shall deem it advisable to do so; and he shall sell at market prices the oil and gas so produced and pay out of the proceeds the necessary expenses of operation and supervision. Full and accurate accounts shall be kept by the receiver of all oil and gas so produced and of the proceeds derived from their sale and the expenses paid therefrom; and these accounts shall be kept in such way that they will show separately the production, proceeds and expenses pertaining to each well so that the net proceeds may be ultimately awarded to the rightful claimant.

5. Before entering upon his duties the receiver shall execute a bond to be approved by the court in the sum of One Hundred Thousand Dollars for the faithful performance of his duties including the disbursement and payment according to the court's direction of all moneys which may come into his hands in the course of the receivership.

6. The receiver shall receive such compensation for his services as may be fixed hereafter by the court.

7. The defendant, the State of Texas, and the complainant, the State of Oklahoma, and their respective officers, agents and employes, and all persons now in possession of any of the said lands or claiming any right, title or interest therein, are directed to

Thursday, (April) 1st 1920, continued

deliver possession thereof to the said receiver and are enjoined until the further order of this court from removing any of the property herein before described from said lands and from conducting any oil or gas mining operations thereon save under the direction and supervision of the receiver and from interfering with the possession, control or operations of the receiver.

8. As to such of the land before described as is not claimed by the defendant, the State of Texas, in its proprietary capacity said State shall have fifteen days within which to file a response to the intervener's motion for an injunction and receiver; and on the filing of such response the State of Texas or any claimant claiming under a patent, lease or permit from that State shall be at liberty to request any modification of this order deemed essential or appropriate for the right or full protection of the interest of such State or claimant.

9. Either the plaintiff, the State of Oklahoma, or the intervener, the United States, may by an amendment of its pleading make any claimant claiming under the State of Texas or any other claimant a party to the cause and have the requisite process issued and served, so that all parties claiming an interest in the subject matter may be before the court. And the like permission is granted to the State of Texas in respect of parties claiming under the State of Oklahoma or the United States.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White,
April 1, 1920.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday, (April) 19th at twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, April 13th 1920 —

3:30 P.M.

The Court met in Special S
Pursuant to a call by the Chi
tice, having the approval of a
Justices.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief J
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Mark R. Green, Esquire, Mar
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the
is opened.

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
27 Orig'l vs.
The State of Texas
Defendant,
The United States,
Intervenor,

Order
Court
recei
vice
son, a

Tuesday, April 13th 1920, continued.

It appearing that Jacob M. Dickinson, Esquire heretofore named as receiver herein, has declined the appointment, it is now ordered that Frederick A. Delano Esquire of Chicago, Illinois, be, and he is hereby, appointed receiver herein in place of the said Jacob M. Dickinson with the same powers and duties and upon the same conditions as were specified in the prior order naming the said Jacob M. Dickinson as receiver.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, April 19th at twelve o'clock.

Monday, April 19th 1920 —

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion duly made to the Court in this behalf, by Mr. William L. Marbury, it is ordered that N. M. Harling, Esquire of Chicago, State of Illinois; Aubin L. Boudware, Esquire and John P. Wingo, Esquire, of Richmond, State of Virginia; George Roscoe Davis, Esquire of Deadwood, State of South Dakota; James C. Rogers, Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia; Donald [illegible], Esquire, of San Francisco

onday, March 19th 1920, continued.

State of California; James Dyson (Scotch) Esquire of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma; and Jesse J. Miller Esquire of Lexington, State of Kentucky be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. N. C. Young, it is ordered that C. J. Murphy Esquire and Tracy R. Bauer Esquire of Grand Forks, State of North Dakota, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. W. McKinney, it is ordered that Frank L. Fetzer, of Denver State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry F. Ashurst, it is ordered that Clifton Mathews, Esquire of Bisbee, State of Arizona

attorney and counsellor of this
and he was sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the
in this behalf by Mr. Thomas J.
Page, it is ordered that Jean O.
Esquire) of Oklahoma City, and
Charles O. Blake of El Reno,
of Oklahoma be admitted to pra
as attorneys and counsellors of
Court, and he was sworn accor
ingly.

On motion first made to the
Court in this behalf by Mr. R.
Evans it is ordered that Jay
Larkin, Esquire) of Plainsbrid
State of Nebraska, be admitte
practice as an attorney and c
sellor of this Court and he wa
sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the
Court in this behalf by Mr. C.
C. Peacock, it is ordered that C
M. Stewart Jr, Esquire) of Phi
delphia) State of Pennsylvania
be admitted to practice as an a
and counsellor of this Court and
he was sworn according ly.

Monday, (April) 19th 1920, continued.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. N. J. Graham, it is ordered that John T. Goshorn, Esquire) of Kansas City, State of Missouri) and George Remus, Esquire), of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lycian M. Parrish, it is ordered R. C. Barkley, Esquire, of Houston; Charles B. Belden, Esquire); A. M. Carrigan, Esquire); Orville Bullington, Esquire) and W. D. Weeks, Esquire), of Wichita Falls, State of Texas be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn according ly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic A. Pike, it is ordered that George Nordlin, Esquire), of St. Paul, State of Minnesota and Clair N. Brickner, Esquire of Fargo, State of North Dakota, be admitted to practice as attorneys and

Monday, April 19th. 1920, cont

were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the
on this behalf by Mr. Frederic
Tyler, it is ordered that Vinc
Victory, Esquire, of Newyork C
Thomas B. Shoemaker, Esquire)
Henry B. Hazard Esquire) of W
ington, District of Columbia,
admitted to practice as attorney
and counsellors of this Court
they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made by
Court in this behalf by Mr. C
Davis, Jr, it is ordered that
R. Clark, Esquire, and Thomas
Schmuck, Esquire of Cincinna
State of Ohio and Fred K. Hoy
Esquire, of South Pasadena
of California be admitted to p
tice as attorneys and counsellors
this Court and they were swor
accordingly.

On motion first made to the
Court by Mr. Solicitor General K
it is ordered that H.J. Pendleto
Esquire, of Winchester, State of
Kentucky and Ernestine Wood
Esquire, of Portland, State of

be admitted to practice as attorney and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. W. Bunn, it is ordered that C.D. Lyons, Esquire, of St Paul, State of Minnesota be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr Horace D. Jones, it is ordered that George W. Reed, Esquire of Boston, State of Massachusetts be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Hawk, Staley, it is ordered that Arthur M. Boal, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Monday, April 19th, 1920, contin

On motion, Leave made to t
Court in this behalf by Mr. G
Gordon it is ordered that Rob
S Palmer, Esquire) of Amonia
State of Nub York, be admitted
(practice) as an attorney and c
sellor of this Court, and he w
sworn accordingly.

On motion, leave made to the C
in this behalf by Mr. A.R. Serven
is ordered that George R. Wallis, E
quire) of Washington, District of
umbia be admitted to practice)
an attorney and counsellor of this
Court and he was sworn accord

On motion, leave made to th
Court in this behalf by Mr. Wi
St. Snelling it is ordered that
Alfred M. Allen, Esquire), of
Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be
mitted to practice as an atto
and counsellor of this Court a
he was sworn accordingly.

On motion, leave made to the
Court in this behalf by Mr. Stu
(Thompson) it is ordered that J. A
L. Bruff, Esquire) of New York be

Monday, April 9th 1923, continued.

as an attorney and counsellor of this Court of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George S. Hawkes, it is ordered that Charles B. Smith, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ormond Simkins, it is ordered that Carl C. Brown, Esquire, of West Plains, State of Missouri; James G. Mathis, Esquire, of Bonifay, State of Florida; Thomas M. Foley, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California; and Frederick W. Wenniston, Esquire, of Wilkes-Barre, State of Pennsylvania be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C.C. Calhoun, it is ordered that Wesley T. Crozier, Esquire, of New York City

and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Langer, it is ordered that N. S. Lauder Esquire) of Wahpeton, State of North Dakota, and S. J. Nuchols, Esquire) of Mandan, State of North Dakota, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lee S. Overman it is ordered that Clyde R. Hoey, Esquire) of Shelby, State of North Carolina be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

17/8 The Estate of P. D. Beckwith, Inc., Petitioner vs. The Commissioner of Patents.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

Monday, April 19th 1920, Continued.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, That the judgment of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice McReynolds.

John M. Simpson,
Sole Surviving Executor of the Estate of John E. Moore, deceased.

Appellant

vs.

The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

213

Monday, April 19th 1920, con

This cause came on to be he
on the transcript of the recor
the Court of Claims and wa
by counsel.

On consideration whereof
now here ordered by this Cour
the judgment of the said Cou
Claims in this cause, be, an
same is hereby affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Clark

(Mr. Justice McKeynolds did
participate in the discussion o
decision of this case).

Canadian Northern
Railway Company,
Petitioner
vs.
Gus Eggen.

281

for the Eighth Circuit.

On w
certi
to the
State
auth
of A

This cause came on to be h
on the transcript of the record
the United States Circuit Cou
Appeals for the Eighth Circ
was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it
now here ordered and adjudg

said United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

228 George E. Burnap, Appellant, vs. The United States. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Oneida Navigation
Corporation, Claimant
of the Sailing Vessel
"Percy R. Pyne 2d" &c.,
Appellant,
vs.
259 W. & S. Job & Company
Inc.
New York.)

This cause came on to be hea
on the transcript of the record from
the District Court of the United S
for the Southern District of New
and was argued by counsel.)

On consideration whereof, It is
here ordered, adjudged and decre
by this Court that this appeal be
the same is hereby dismissed fo
want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Brand

The Penn Mutual
Life Insurance
Company,
Petitioner,
499. vs.
Ephraim Lederer,
Collector of Internal

Monday, April 19th, 1920, continued.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed, with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

134 The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Chase National Bank.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the

Monday, April 19th 1920, continued.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Clarke.

Michael W. Boehmer,
Petitioner,
vs.
191.
Pennsylvania Railroad Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit

Monday, April 19th 1920, continued:

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds

C. B. Munday, Trustee
La Salle Street Trust
& Savings Bank and
William C. Niblack,
as receiver of said
La Salle Street Trust
and Savings Bank,
Plaintiffs in Error,

288 vs.

Wisconsin Trust Com-
pany and Farmers Loan
& Trust Company,
Executors of Frederick

Monday, April 19th 1920, continu

In error to the Supreme C
of the State of Wisconsin.

This cause came on
be heard on the transcript of
record from the Supreme Cour
the State of Wisconsin and was
argued by Counsel,

On Consideration whereof, T
now here ordered and adjudg
by this Court that the judg
of the said Supreme Court in
this cause be, and the same
hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McK

First National
Bank of Canton,
Pennsylvania,
Appellant,

618 vs.

John D. Ketton Williams,
Comptroller of the
Currency.

This cause came on to be heard
the transcript of the record from
District Court of the United Sta
for the Middle District of Penn
vania, and was argued by c
sel.

Appeal
the West
Court of
United
from the
Middle
District
Pennsyl

Monday, April 19th, 1920, continued

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McKeynolds.

David F. Houston, Secretary of the Treasury, and John Burke, Treasurer of the United States, Appellants, vs. Forest L. Ormes, Administrator of the Estate of Belva A. Lockwood, deceased. } Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

86

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and was

Monday, April 19th 1920, cont

On consideration whereof, I
now here ordered, adjudged
decreed by this Court that t
decree of the said Court of Ap
in this cause be, and the same
is hereby affirmed with cost
Per Mr. Justice Pitne

Elizabeth Stull,
Administratrix of
John M. Stull de-
ceased for the
benefit of Elizabeth
Stull, mother of de-
ceased.
Petitioner

151

vs.

The Philadelphia
& Reading Railway
Company.

On writ
certiora
to the C
of Appe
of the S
of Mary

This cause came on to be hear
the transcript of the record from t
Court of Appeals of the State of
land and was argued by coun

On consideration whereof, I
now here ordered and adjudged
this Court that the judgment of t
said Court of Appeals in this c
be, and the same is hereby affir

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Clarke.

Ralph N. Cameron, Niles J. Cameron, B. A. Cameron, S. D. Peppin and L. L. Perrall, Appellants,

205 vs.

The United States, of America.

Appeals from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Arizona.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Monday, April 19th 1920, continued.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Everett L. Simpson. In error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Colorado.

444

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Colorado, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter, dissenting: Mr. Justice Clarke

Blumenstock Brothers Advertising Agency, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Curtis Publish-

197

Monday, April 19th 1920, continued.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

O. O. Askren Attorney General of the State of New Mexico et al., Appellants, vs. The Continental Oil Company. } Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of New Mexico.

521

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of New Mexico and was argued by coun-

On consideration whereof, I
now here ordered, adjudged an
decreed by this Court, that the
of the said District Court in th
cause be, and the same is her
affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

O. O. Askren, Attorney
General of the State
of New Mexico, et al.,
Appellants,
vs.
Sinclair Refining Com-
pany.

522

Appea
the Dist
Court o
United
for the
trict of
Mexic

This cause came on to be he
on the transcript of the record fro
the District Court of the United
for the District of New Mexico, a
was argued by Counsel.

On consideration whereof, I
now here ordered, adjudged and
creed by this Court, that the de
of the said District Court of the
States, in this cause be, and the
is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Da

Monday, April 19th 1920, continued.

O. O. Askren, Attorney General of the State of New Mexico et al., Appellants, vs. The Texas Company. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of New Mexico.

523

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of New Mexico, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

Thomas P. Kennedy, as Administrator of the Estate of Ronald E. Kinney, deceased, Petitioner, vs. Supreme Lodge of the World, Loyal Order of Moose. — On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

269.

Monday, April 19th 1920, continue

This cause came on to be hea
on the transcript of the record f
the Supreme Court of the State
Illinois and was argued by
counsel

On consideration whereof, I
now here ordered and adjudged b
this Court that the writ of certi
in this cause be, and the same i
hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Justice Holme

Thomas P. Kenney,
as Administrator
of the Estate of Donald
E. Kenney, deceased,
Plaintiff in Error,

In erro
to the
Supreme
of the
of Ill

303.

vs.

Supreme Lodge of the
World, Loyal Order
of Moose.

This cause came on to be hea
on the transcript of the record f
the Supreme Court of the State
Illinois, and was argued by
counsel.

On consideration whereof, I
now here ordered and adjudged
by this Court that the judgment
of the said Supreme Court in this

Monday, April 19th 1920, continued.

be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to said Supreme Court, for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

609. The State of Missouri, Appellant, vs. Ray P. Holland, United States Game Warden. } Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri, and was argued by counsel,

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court, that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Van Devanter

Mr. Justice Pitney.

Monday, April 19th 1920, continued.

102

The Cuyahoga River Power Company, Appellant, vs. The Northern Ohio Traction & Light Company, and The Northern Ohio Power Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the northern District of Ohio and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

(Mr. Justice Day and Mr. Justice Clarke took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

Monday, April 19th 1920, continued.

The South Covington & Cincinnati Street Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The Commonwealth of Kentucky.

In error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

252

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Day
Mr. Justice Van Devanter
Mr. Justice Pitney

The Cincinnati Covington & Erlanger Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The Commonwealth

253

Monday April 19th 1920, continued

In error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Day,
Mr. Justice Van Devanter
Mr. Justice Pitney.

631 Edgar L. Caldwell, Appellant, vs. W. E. Parker, Sheriff of Calhoun County, Alabama. In error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Alabama.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States

and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the final order of said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Queens Land Title Company and Marra Pegua Shore Company, Appellants,
vs.
Kings County Trust Company & Title Guarantee & Trust Company.

297

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby

Monday, April 19th 1920, continued.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Mary Willcox, a Creditor of Mrs Kate King, a Bankrupt,

Appellant,

266 vs

Lawson E. Bradley Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of Mrs Kate King a bankrupt.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Metropolitan West Side Elevated Railway Company and Aurora Elgin & Chicago Railroad Company,

Plaintiffs in Error,

283

Monday, April 19th 1920, continued.

Maclay Hoyne, States Attorney for Cook County, Illinois for and on behalf of the People of the State of Illinois et al. — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Metropolitan West Side Elevated Railway Company and Aurora, Elgin & Chicago Railroad Company, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

283. The Sanitary District of Chicago and Fitz Simons & Connell Company.

Monday, April 19th 1920, continued

295 E. N. Blancett (Plaintiff in Error) vs. The State of New Mexico. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

423 Chicago and Northwestern Railway Company (Plaintiff in Error) vs. Herman Vande Zande. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is

Monday, April 19th 1920, continued.

this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States, Appellant, vs. Wayne County, Kentucky. 233

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

L. D. Backus, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Norfolk Southern Railroad Company. 263

In error to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the

by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of er in this cause, be, and the same hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice W

287

A. R. Glascock and The Deming Investment Company

Plaintiffs in Error,

vs.

Ellis McDaniel et al, minors, by J. O. Cravens, Guardian

In error the Sup Court the Sta of Okla homa

This cause came on to be hea on the transcript of the record fro the Supreme Court of the State o Oklahoma and was argued b counsel.

On consideration whereof, It now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of er in this cause, be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the wa of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Monday, April 19th 1920, continued.

731 J. J. Dillon, Appellant, vs. R. N. Gloss, Deputy Collector of Internal Revenue. On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied without prejudice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

808 William J. Givens, Appellant, vs. Fred G. Zerbst, Warden &c. On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 11th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

382 Michael F. Maugan, Administrator, vs. The United States. On consideration of the motion to remand this cause to the Court of Claims for additional

Monday, April 19th 1920, contin

It is now here ordered by
Court that the said motion be
and the same is hereby de
Per Mr. Chief Justice

581

Mary L. Grew Conklin,
Appellant,
vs.
George N. Conklin et
al.

It is
by th
Coun
the fi
consi
tion o

motion for a writ of certiora
suggestion of diminution of the
cord in this cause, be, and t
same is hereby postponed
the hearing of the case on the
merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justic

581

Mary L. Grew Conklin,
Appellant,
vs.
George N. Conklin et
al.

On co
tion o
motion
place
case
summ

docket.

It is now here ordered by
Court that the said motion
and the same is hereby gra

Per Mr. Chief Justice

Monday, April 19th 1920, continued.

405 John Barton Payne, Secretary of the Interior et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The United States of America ex rel. Allen L. Newton. It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

779 and 780 The United States, Petitioner, vs. National Surety Company. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby

N. Snowden Marshall,
as Receiver, &c.,
Petitioner

836 vs.

The People of the State
of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Benjamin Horowitz
and Hyman Horowitz.
Plaintiffs in Error,

693 vs.

The United States of
America.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby de

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Monday, April 19th, 1920, continued.

737 Barber Ed Company, Inc., Petitioner vs. Steamship "Knutsford" Limited. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

753 Arthur Bain Petitioner vs. The United States of America. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and of

as well in support of as against the same, it is nowhere ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby d

Per Mr. Chief Justice Wh

758 Charles J. Bauman, Petitioner. vs. The United States of America.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now hereby ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Wh

759 Webb Jay et al., Petitioners vs. Frederick Weinberg et al.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of

Monday, April 19th 1920, continued.

Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court, that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Jesse C. Washburn et al., Petitioners
vs.
769 E. N. Gillespie

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

772 Murle L. Rowe, as Trustee, etc., Petitioner, vs. James L. Hutchen et al. On Petit for writ certiora to the U States C cuit Co of Appe

for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of Counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now hereby ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

785 Shelley B. Hutchinson, Petitioner, vs. William M. Sperry et al. On Petit for writ certiora to the U States C cuit Co

of Appeals for the Third Circu

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third

Monday, April 19th 1920, continued.

Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered and by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

799. Christian Joerig et al., Petitioners, vs. F. J. Honohoe et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court, that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

New York Central
Railroad Company,
Claimant of the
Barge "Chapin" &c,
Petitioner,
807 vs.
John S. Howell et al.

for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the p
for a writ of certiorari herein t
United States Circuit Court o
Appeals for the Second Circu
and of the argument of counse
thereupon had, as well in sup
of as against the same, it is
now here ordered by this Cour
that the said petition be, and
same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice W

Elizabeth Penny Gregg,
Petitioner
834 vs.
Francis P. Garvan,
Alien Property Cus-
todian.

On consideration of the Peti
for a writ of certiorari
to the S
Supreme C
of the S
of Penns
for a writ of certiorari herein
the Supreme Court of the State

Monday, April 19th, 1920, Continued.

the State of Pennsylvania) and on the Argument of Counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

835 A. J. Kelly, Jr., and P. B. McKnight, Trustees under the Will of Bessie Penny Gregg, deceased, Petitioners vs. Francis P. Garvan, Alien Property Custodian. On Petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania and of the argument of Counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Monday, April 19th 1920, cont

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Nos. 23 and 24, Original.—October Term, 1919.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania,
Complainant,
vs.
The State of West Virginia.

The State of Ohio, Complainant,
vs.
The State of West Virginia.

On Consideration of the respective motions of the complainants for the appointment of a Special Master and of the defendant for the appointment of a Commissioner to take the testimony and report the same to the Court and of the motions to consolidate the cases for the purpose of taking such testimony,

It is now here Ordered that the motions to consolidate the cases for the purpose of taking the proofs be, and the same are hereby, granted.

It is Further Ordered that Mr. Levi Cooke, of the District of Columbia, be, and he is hereby, appointed a Commissioner to take and return the testimony in these causes, with the powers of a Master in Chancery, as provided in the rules of this Court; but said Commissioner shall not make any findings of fact or state any conclusions of law.

It is Further Ordered that the complainants shall take their evidence, at such place or places as they may indicate, between the first day of May, 1920, and the first day of October, 1920, upon giving ten days' notice of the time and place of taking such evidence to the counsel for the defendant; that the defendant may take evidence, at such place or places as it may indicate, between the first day of October, 1920, and the first day of March, 1921, upon giving ten days' notice of the time and place of taking such evidence to the counsel for the complainants; that the complainants shall take their evidence in rebuttal between the first day of

March, 1921, and the first day of April, 1921, at such place or places as they may indicate, upon giving ten days' notice to counsel for defendant, and the defendant shall then conclude the taking of its evidence in surrebuttal on or before the first day of May, 1921, upon giving ten days' notice of the time and place of taking such evidence to the counsel for complainants. *Provided, however*, that if complainants shall conclude the taking of their evidence in chief before the first day of October, 1920, and shall give notice thereof, the time for the taking of evidence in chief on the part of defendant shall begin to run fifteen days after the giving of said notice by the complainants; and if the defendant shall conclude the taking of its evidence before the first day of March, 1921, and shall give notice thereof, the thirty-one days' time for the taking of evidence in rebuttal on behalf of the complainants shall begin to run fifteen days after the giving of said notice by the defendant; and the thirty days time for the taking of evidence on behalf of defendant in surrebuttal shall begin to run from the termination of said thirty days' allowed for the taking of the evidence in rebuttal by the complainants; but nothing in this proviso contained shall operate or be construed to postpone the ultimate dates for the commencement of the time for the taking of the defendant's evidence in chief, the complainants' evidence in rebuttal and the defendant's evidence in surrebuttal, respectively, first above specified.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the said complainants and the defendant, respectively, shall make such deposits with the Clerk of this Court for fees, costs and expenses of the said Clerk and of the said Commissioner as they may from time to time be requested by said Clerk.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Chief Justice announce
that the call of the docket wi
suspended for the term on (4)
the 30th instant, and no Petit
for writs of certiorari or motio
except motions for admission
practice, will be received aft
Tuesday, June 1st next.

Louis C. Tiffany, Sole
Surviving Executor
and Trustee under
the Last Will and
Testament of Charles
L. Tiffany, deceased,
Appellant,

209. vs.

The United States.

Appe
the Co
Cla

This cause came on to be heard
the transcript of the record from
Court of Claims and Mr. Solici
General Kuiq, of counsel for the ap
having filed a confession of err
moved the Court to reverse the
ment herein.

It is Therefore, in pursuanc
said confession and motion, no
ordered and adjudged by this
that the judgment of the said C
of Claims in this cause be

same is hereby reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Court of Claims for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

833 Western Union Telegraph Company, Petitioner, vs S. B. Foster. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander King in behalf of Mr. Rush Taggart, ~~and~~ Mr. Francis Raymond Stark, Mr. Henry E. Davis and Mr. P. A. Willcox for the petitioner, with leave to the Solicitor General of the United States to file suggestions.

Orig. Ex Parte In the Matter of James J. O'Brien Petitioner. The motion for leave to file petition for writs of mandamus and prohibition herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James J. O'Brien pro se.

Monday, April 19th 1920, continued.

Knickerbocker Ice Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
543 Lillian E. Stewart.

Leave granted to file an additional brief, on motion of Mr. N. E. Sullivan in behalf of Mr. Frank R. Savidge for the Plaintiff in Error.

J. Leroy Nickel et al., Trustees &c., et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
775 George A. Cole as State Comptroller &c.
and
Nellie Miller Nickel et al., Trustee &c et al.
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
776 The State of Nevada

Leave granted to file amended writs of error on motion of Mr. Erskine Wood in that behalf.

Monday, April 19th 1920, continued.

797 Guyanet Fruit Company
Petitioner,
vs.
Johnson Show Works
Limited.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter S. Penfield for the petitioner.

710 The Merchants National Bank of Richmond, Virginia,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The City of Richmond.

The motion to dismiss or affirm herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H.R. Pollard, and Mr. George Wayne Anderson for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Legh R. Page and Mr. E. Warren Hall for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

786 E. A. King &c.,
Petitioner
vs.
Robert H. Barr
et als,

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the considera-

Monday, April 19th 1920, continued

and Mr. William C. Briston for the petitioner and by Mr. C. E. D. Wood for the respondent.

667 William L. Walls, Attorney General of the State of Wyoming et al., vs. Midland Carbon Company et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney in behalf of counsel.

684 Piedmont Power & Light Company Appellant, vs. The Town of Graham et al. — and James R. Paschall et al., Appellants, vs. The Town of Graham et al.

685

The motion to dismiss or affirm or place on the Summary docket herein was submitted to the consid-

tion of the Court by Mr. Clyde R. Hoey, Mr. Charles H. Tillett and Mr. William P. Bynum for the appellees in support of the motion, and by Mr. James H. Bridgers for the appellant in opposition thereto.

Philadelphia & Reading Railway Co., Petitioner,
842 vs.
Maria Domenica Di Donato;

Philadelphia & Reading Railway Co., Petitioner,
843 vs.
Annie Reynolds; and
Philadelphia & Reading Railway Co., Petitioner,
844 vs.
Marie E. Polk.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George Gowen Parry for the petitioner and by Mr. Francis M. McAdams for the respondents in Nos. 843 and 844.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
27 Orig'l vs.

Monday, April 19th 1920, continued.

The petition for leave to intervene by the Agricultural Aid Association and twenty-two others was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles F. McGuire in that behalf.

768 Anna N. Waton et al., Executors &c., Plaintiffs in Error, vs The State Comptroller of the State of New York. The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick Tyler in behalf of counsel for the Plaintiffs in error.

864 Grant Smith-Porter Ship Company, vs Herman F. Rohde. The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles A. Hart for the Grant Smith-Porter Ship Company.

Monday, April 19th 1920, continued.

726 Sarah A. Whittemore, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Maud B. Crawford. The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas M. Baker for the defendant in error in support of the motion.

27 Orig. The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, vs. The State of Texas. The motions to modify order appointing receiver herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mrs. Lillie Morgan et al, National Oil Co., et al, Sinclair Oil & Gas Co., et al; T. P. Roberts; R. D. Allen; James B. McMahon, lessee; J. L. Schnakenberg et al; George P. Holtzer; J. N. Kinney et al, and Bass Petroleum Company as to real estate and personal property.

493 City Trust Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Bankers' Mortgage Loan Company. The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank N. Gaines

in error in support of the motion and by Mr. Sylvester R Rush for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

592

Missouri Kansas & Texas Railway Company et al,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Hannah L. Zuber.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles M Smith for the defendant in error in support of the motion and by Mr. J. M. Bryson, Mr. Clifford L. Jackson, Mr. Gardiner Lathrop, Mr. J. R. Collingham, Mr. S. H. Hayes, Mr. Alexander Britton and Mr. C. E. Burg for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

615

David G. Wine,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. C. Hausburg for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Monday, April 19th 1920, continued.

767 The State of Louisiana, Petitioner vs. William A. Joyce & Company et al. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Winans Wall for the petitioner and by Mr. Robert R. Reid and Mr. Henry Dutts for the respondent.

782 Herman Bloch Petitioner vs. The United States of America. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. B. Nudelseth, Mr. George E. Wallace and Mr. St. Clair Adams for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

798 Gerhardt Wessels Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.

Monday April 19th 1920, contin

The petition for a writ of c
orari herein was submitted to
consideration of the Court by
R.H. Ward for the petitioner and
Mr. Assistant Attorney Gener
Stewart and Mr. Starr J. Rudg
for the respondent.

802

New York Central &
Hudson River Rail-
road Company
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
York & Whitney
Company.

The pe
for a
of cer
herein
was s
mitted
the co
sideral
of the
for the
petitione
Mr. William L. Par
for the Plaintiff in Error in support
the petition.

803

York & Whitney
Company
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
New York Central &
Hudson River Rail-
road Company.

The pe
for a w
certio
herein
submit
to the
sidera
of the
for the
by Mr. Amos L. Taylor for the Plaintiff in Error in support o
the petition.

Monday, April 19th 1920, continued.

812 Herman Theden et al., Petitioners vs. The Union Pacific Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. A. Kellinger for the petitioner and by Mr. S. Stoomis Mr. R. W. Blair and Mr. O. M. Lilland for the respondent.

816 Albert A. Houghton, et al., Petitioners vs. Eugene A. Enslen et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Z. P. Rudulph for the petitioners.

817 Anna Lang, as Administratrix &c., Petitioner, vs. New York Central Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hamilton Ward

Monday, April 19th 1920, contin

M. L. Spratt for the respondent

Archie J. McLaren,
Administrator &c.,
Petitioner,
831. vs.
L. G. Fleischer.

The Pet
for a w
of cert
herein
submitte
to the C
sideration of the Court by Mr. Sa
Herrick for the Petitioner.

Robert L. Culbertson,
Petitioner,
832 vs.
James M. Ochiltree.

The Pet
for a w
of cert
herein
submitte
to the consideration of the Court b
Samuel Herrick for the Petitio

Dreman-Sweet Com-
pany,
Petitioner
852 vs.
Luminous Unit
Company.

The Petit
for a wr
of certiora
herein w
submitted
to the con
sideration
of the Co
by Mr. Paul Bakewell for the P
titioner and by Mr. Harry Lea Hod
for the respondent.

Monday, April 19th 1920, continued.

856 H. W. Ryan Towboat Company, Inc., Petitioner vs. Carrie S. Draper, et al. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Charles Harris for the petitioner.

857 Bowers Southern Dredging Company, Petitioner, vs. Carrie S. Draper et al. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Neethe and Mr. J. W. Perry for the petitioner.

806 The District of Columbia, Petitioner, vs. Saks & Company. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. N. Stephens for the petitioner.

805 The District of Columbia,
Petitioner,
vs.
R. P. Andrews Paper
Company.

The Pe
for a
of cer
herein
submit
to the c
sideration of the Court by Mr. A.
Stephens for the Petitioner.

807 The District of Columbia,
Petitioner,
vs.
Abraham Lisner.

The Pet
for a w
of certio
herein
submitte
to the Court by
A. A. Stephens for the Petitioner.

800 Klumpp Company,
et al.,
Petitioners
vs.
Pasadena Canning
Company, et al.

The Pet
for a w
of certio
herein
submitte
to the co
sideratio
of the Court by Mr. Fred L. Chapp
Mr. Henry H. Cooper, and Mr. C
Isaac S. Hodges for the Petitioner,
by Mr. Kemper B. Campbell, Mr
Francis J. Heney, Mr. Frederick S. L
and Mr. William J. Carr for the

Monday, April 19th 1920, continued

502 Southern Cotton Oil Company, Arkadelphia Milling Company, J. F. Hasley & Sons, et al. Appellants, vs. St. Louis Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Company. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Arkansas.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

See Mr. Chief Justice White

698 The Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad Company and Walker D. Hines, Director General of Railroads. vs. Marie L. Thompson

On a certificate from the U
States Circuit Court of Appeal
for the Third Circuit.

It appearing to the Court tha
a stipulation of counsel for the
respective parties to dismiss th
certificate has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of s
stipulation it is now here ordere
by this Court, that this certificat
and the same is hereby dismis

Per Mr. Chief Justice Wh

The New York Even-
ing Post,
Petitioner
vs.
796 John Armstrong
Chaloner.

On petit
for a wr
of certio
to the U
States C
cuit Co
of Ap

for the Second Circuit.

It appearing to the Court tha
motion of counsel for the petitio
to dismiss the petition for a wr
of certiorari herein has been file

Therefore, in pursuance of sa
motion, It is now here ordered by
Court, that the said petition be, a
the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Wh

Monday, April 19th 1920, continued.

The Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error,
366 vs.
Road Improvement District Number one of Prairie County Arkansas.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the Plaintiff in Error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed.

Therefore in pursuance of said motion it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
367 vs.

Monday, April 19th 1920, continue

Improvement District
et al.

In error
the Sup
Court o

State of Arkansas.

It appearing to the Court th
motion of counsel for the plaint
in error to dismiss the writ of er
in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of sa
motion, it is now here ordered an
adjudged by this Court, that the w
of error in this cause be, and
same is hereby, dismissed with
costs.

Per M. Chief Justice

Alice Holbert et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
No. — Ed. R. Patrick et al.

The motio
for leave
proceed
forma pa
herein wa

submitted to the consideration of the
Court by Mr. M. N. Vann for the pl
tiffs in error.

Ernest B. Blane
Plaintiff in Error,
764 vs.
Charles L. Burrill,

This cause
was continu
per stipul
tion of cou

Monday April 19th 1920, continued.

811 E. A. Frew, et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Lynn J. Frazier, Governor et al.

This cause was advanced to be heard with No 508 on motion of Mr. Frederick A. Pike for the defendants in error.

508 John M. Scott et al., Appellants, vs. Lynn J. Frazier et al.; and E. A. Frew et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Lynn J. Frazier, Governor et al.

811

Two hours were allowed each side for the argument of these cases. Argument commenced by Mr. N. C. Young for the appellants in No. 508. continued by Mr. Tracy R. Bangs for the appellants in No 508, and by Mr. Thomas C. Taggett for the plaintiffs in error, in No 811.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, April 20th 1920

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices

Frank K. Green Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles F. McNary it is ordered that W. P. LaRoche, Esquire of Portland State of Oregon be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Huston

Tuesday, April 20th 1920, continued.

Haux hurst Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Louis Eppler Esquire, it is ordered that Fuller Barnard, Jr. Esqeire of Cumberland State of Maryland be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wayne B. Wheeler, it is ordered that Nathan W. Littlefield, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf Mr. Williame Langer it is ordered that Albert E. Sheets, Jr. Esquire of Bismark, State of North Dakota be admitted

Tuesday, April 20th 1920, continued

sellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court by Mr. Thomas Stell it is ordered that Isaiah S. Wood Esquire, of Webster, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. R. Green, it is ordered that Carl Steinerman, Esquire of Washington District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. Cleghorn, it is ordered that W. J. Martin, Esquire; and Richard Merrick, Esquire; of Washington District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

Tuesday, April 20th 1920, continued.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Selden P. Spencer, it is ordered that Henry R. Kroste, Esquire of St Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn according ly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fritz G. Lanham it is ordered that Oscar O'Neill Touchstone, Esquire of Dallas, State of Texas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn according ly.

George S. Hawke
Plaintiff in Error,
582 Orig. vs.
Harvey C. Smith,
Secretary of State
of Ohio.

Leave granted to file brief as amicus curiae on motion of Mr. Wayne B. Wheeler

in that behalf.

John M. Scott et al.,
Appellants,
508 vs.

Tuesday, April 20th 1920, continued.

811 E. A. Greer et al., Plaintiff's in Error, vs. Lynn J. Frazier, Governor et al. The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. S. L. Nuckols and Mr. W. S. Lauder, for the appellees in No. 508, by Mr. Frederick A. Pike for certain appellees and defendants in error in Nos. 508 and 811, and concluded by Mr. C. J. Murphy for appellants in No. 508.

492 Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner, vs. Anderson Gratz et al. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Huston Thompson for the Petitioner and continued by Mr. Thomas D. Magner for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at Twelve o'clock.

Wednesday, April 21st 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George H. Sutton, it is ordered that George Thompson Motlow, Esquire, of Lynchburg, State of Tennessee be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. M.

Wednesday, April 21st 1920, continued

John A. Verhoeven, Esquire of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On Motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. C. Clephane it is ordered that Mark E. Guerin, Esquire of Chicago, State of Illinois; Watter Guest Kellogg, Esquire of Ogdensburg, State of New York and Beverly Allen Read, Esquire of Dallas, State of Texas be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. J. Wilson it is ordered that Gilbert Potter Bullis, Esquire of Vidalia, State of Louisiana be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner

Wednesday, April 21st 1920, continued.

Anderson Gratz et al. vs. Walker D. Hines, Director General &c, et al.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Thomas D. Magner for the respondents.

683

George Wallace et al, vs. Walker D. Hines, Director General &c, et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. D. E. Packard for the appellants, by Mr. E. Marvin Underwood for the appellee Hines &c, and by Mr. Charles H. Bunn for the appellee railway companies.

Two and one half hours allowed appellants in the argument of these cases.

15 to 21 inc.

Jack Amos and others known as the Mississippi Choctaws. vs. Nick K. Winton Administrator &c, and others,

Re Argument commenced by Mr. William H. Scott for the appellants in No 15. and continued by Mr. Guion Miller for the appellants in No 21. Proclamation being made, the court is

Thursday, April 22d 1920,

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices

Frank H. Grunt, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick W. Mulliger it is ordered that Herbert A. Buck, Esquire of Boston, State of Massachusetts be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Thursday, April 22d, 1920, continued.

Wirt R. Winton, Administrator &c., and others, Appellants,
15 to 21. vs.
Jack Amos and others known as the Missisippi Choctaws.

The re-argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Guion Miller for the appellants in Nos. 16 to 21; by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Davis for the appellee; by Mr. H. H. Scott for the appellants in No 15, and concluded by Mr. Guion Miller for the appellants in Nos 16 to 21.

Edward White, Commissioner of Immigration for the Port of San Francisco, Petitioner,
506 vs.
Chin Dong.

This cause was argued by Mr Assistant Attorney General Stewart for the Petitioner. and by Mr. Jackson H. Ralston for the respondent.

Thursday, April 22d 1920, continued.

566 The City of New York, Appellant, vs. The Consolidated Gas Company of New York et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Vincent Victory for the appellant and by Mr. John A. Earner for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Friday, April 23d 1920

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associated Justices.

Mark K. Green Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Kenneth D. McKellar it is ordered that Claude B. Sanford Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John

Friday, April 23d 1920, continued.

Robert N. Garruth, Esquire of Warren, State of Arkansas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas Supreme Court Maxwell it is ordered that Amory Lee, Esquire, of Pocahontas State of Kansas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Scott, it is ordered that James Henderson Lee Esquire of Detroit State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

George S. Hawkes,
Plaintiff in Error,
582 and 601. vs.
Harvey C. Smith,
Secretary of State of
Ohio.

This cause was argued by Mr. J. Frank Hanly for the Plaintiff in error and

Friday, April 23d 1920, continued.

defendant in error.

534 Leslie C. Stallings, Appellant, vs. Maurice S. Slain U.S. Marshal, &c. — This cause was argued by Mr. William B. Jaynes for the Solicitor appellant and by Mr. General King for the appellee.

628 Chicago, Milwaukee & St Paul Railway Company, Petitioner vs. McCaull-Dinsmore Company. — This cause was argued by Mr. O. W. Dynes for the petitioner and submitted by Mr. J. C. P. Wheelwright for the respondent.

728 Porto Rico Railway Light & Power Company, vs. Adalberto Diaz Mor. — This cause was argued by Mr. G. Carroll Walter for the Porto Rico Railway, Light & Power Co. No brief filed for

Friday, April 23d 1920, continued.

Daniel O'Connell et al, Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
221 The United States of America.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Gilbert E. Roe, for the Plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at twelve o'clock.

Monday, April 26th 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna.
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James Clark McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Associate Justices

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court by Mr. Mason M. Richardson it is ordered that Edwin L. Wilson, Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn according ly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John A. Brown it is ordered that Thomas E.

Monday, April 26th 1920, cont

of Illinois be admitted to
tice as an attorney and co
sellor of this Court and he
sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the
in this behalf by Mr. Harry K. So
it is ordered that Fred H. Gus
Esquire) and Alexander K. McK
Esquire, of Washington, Distr
Columbia be admitted to prac
as attorneys and counsellors o
Court, and they were sworn a
ingly.

On motion first made to
Court by Mr. Frederic D. M
it is ordered that Harry Summ
Carson Esquire), of Minnia
State of Minnesota be admitt
practice as an attorney and
sellor of this Court and he
sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to th
in this behalf by Mr. C. C. Wo
it is ordered that Fred H. Sarg
Esquire of the Illinois State
be admitted to practice as
attorney and counsellor of thi

Monday April 26th 1920, continued.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas Sterling it is ordered that Edward N. Wilbor, Esquire, of Salem, State of South Dakota be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. C. Howell it is ordered that Charles A. Christopherson, Esquire, of Sioux Falls, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Levi Cooke it is ordered that Henry C. Lauk, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. P. Donnell it is ordered that Gregor

State of Ohio, and Robert B. Dennell, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General King it is ordered that Otto A. Schlobohm, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

*

The United States of America, Appellant,

vs.

Reading Company, Philadelphia & Reading Railway Company et al.;

and

Reading Company, Philadelphia & Reading Railway Company et al., Appellants,

* On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert E. Shutts, it is ordered that George E. Wallace of Bismark, State of North Dakota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court as he was sworn accordingly.

onday, April 26th 1920, continued.

The United States of America, Appellants, vs. United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. } Appeals from the District Court of the

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania on appeal and cross-appeal, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed in part and reversed in part; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court with direction to enter a decree in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Dissenting:
Mr. Chief Justice White,
Mr. Justice Holmes

Monday, April 26th 1920, continued.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds and Mr. Justice Brandeis took no part in the consideration or decision of this case)

224 Coleman J. Ward et al., Petitioners vs. The Board of County Commissioners of Love County, Oklahoma. On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

289

280

Monday, April 26th 1920, continued.

George R. Broadwell,
Petitioner,
vs.
The Board of County
Commissioners of
Carter County, Okla-
homa.

On writ of
certiorari
to the Su-
preme Court
of the State
of Oklahoma.)

This cause came on to be heard
on the transcript of the record from
the Supreme Court of the State of
Oklahoma and was argued by counsel.
On consideration whereof, It is
now here ordered and adjudged by
this Court that the judgment of the
said Supreme Court in this cause
be and the same is hereby reversed
with costs; and that this cause be,
and the same is hereby remanded
to the said Supreme Court for
further proceedings not inconsistent
with the opinion of this Court.
Per Mr. Justice VanDevanter.

Emily M. Maguire,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
William D. T. Trefry,
Tax Commissioner of
the Commonwealth of

Monday, April 26th 1920, cont

In error to the Superior Cou
the State of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be he
on the transcript of the record
the Superior Court of the State
Massachusetts and was argu
counsel.

On consideration whereof
now here ordered and adjudg
by this Court that the judgment
said Superior Court, in this ca
and the same is hereby affirm
costs.

Per Mr. Justice Hol

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The United States,
Appellant,
vs.
Atlantic Dredging
Company, W. L. Brooks
agent.

214

This cause came on to be hea
the transcript of the record from
Court of Claims, and was argue
counsel.

On consideration whereof, It
now here ordered and adjudged
this Court that the judgment

Monday, April 26th, 1920, continued.

Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Dissenting:
The Chief Justice.
Mr. Justice Clarke.

493. City Trust Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Bankers Mortgage Loan Company. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

27 Orig. The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, vs. The State of Texas

Monday, April 26th 1920, cont

The United States. Intervenor.

On consid
tion of th
tions pres

Presented by James H. McMahon
Roberts, Lillis Morgan, et al.,
clair Oil & Gas Company, Mal
Oil Company, et al., R. S. Allu
N. Runion et al., J. L. Schnaken
et al., George P. Holtzen, and Bas
Petroleum Company for modifi
tions of the interlocutory order g
ing an injunction) and addi
a received; and on consideration
the motion) of the Agriculture) a
Association et al., for leave to i
vene; it is ordered that the S
of Oklahoma, The State of Texa
and the United States do sev
on or before Monday, May 3
show cause, if such there be, why
motions, and each of them, shou
be granted.

Per W. Chief Justice W

Ex Parte In the
Matter of James J.
-Orig. O'Brien,
Petitioner,

On consid
tion of th
motion f
leave to
petition f
prohibition

writ of mandamus or

Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Alice Nolbert and John N. Nolbert,
Plaintiffs in Error,
No— vs.
Ed K. Patrick and Mrs T. C. Galbraith.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

William L. Walls Attorney General of the State of Wyoming, Frank A. Little, Prosecuting Attorney of Big Horn County,
Appellants,
667 vs.
Midland Carbon Company and Occidental Oil & Gas Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is ordered

Monday, April 26th 1920, continued

and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 11th next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Anna N. Watson
and Frederick Watson
as Executors of the
Last Will & Testament
of Charles N. Watson,
deceased,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The State Comptroller
of the State of New York.

768

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 11th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, April 26th 1920, continued

Grant Smith-Porter Ship Company
vs.
Herman F. Rohde.

864

On consideration of the motion to advance this case to be heard with cases Nos. 689 and 771, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Missouri, Kansas and Texas Railway Company, Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company et al.
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Hannah L. Zuber.

592

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby postponed to the hearing of the cause on the writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, April 26th 1920, continued

The Merchants National Bank of Richmond, Virginia, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The City of Richmond. 710

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Merchants National Bank of Richmond, Virginia, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The City of Richmond. 710

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed to the hearing of the cause on the writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Charles E. Smith, Appellant vs. Kansas City Title & Trust Company. 593.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be restored to the docket for

Monday, April 26th 1929, continued.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

802 The New York Central and Hudson River Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. York & Whitney Company. On petition for a writ of certiorari to the Superior Court of the State of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court of the State of Massachusetts and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the transcript of record on the writ of error to stand as a return ~~to the writ of error to stand as a return~~ to the writ of certiorari.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

803 York & Whitney Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The New York Central

Monday, April 26th 1920, continued

road Company. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Superior Court of the State of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court of the State of Massachusetts and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the transcript of record on the writ of error to stand as a return to the writ of certiorari.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

805 The District of Columbia, Petitioner vs. R. P. Andrews Paper Company. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and of the argument of

Monday, April 26th 1920, continued.

support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The District of Columbia, Petitioner
vs.
806 Saks and Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The District of Columbia
Petitioner,
807 vs.
Abraham Lisner.

On petition for writ of certiorari

trict of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

817

Anna Lang as Administratrix &c., of Oscar G. Lang, deceased, Petitioner. vs. New York Central Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Monday, April 26th, 1920, continued.

831 Archie J. McLaren, Administrator of the Estate of John McLaren, deceased, Petitioner, vs. L. G. Fleischer — On Petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

832 Robert L. Culpepper, Petitioner vs. James M. Ochelree. — On Petition for writ of certiorari to to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California and of the argu-

as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Western Union Telegraph Company, Petitioner
vs.
833 S. B. Poston.
of South Carolina.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Philadelphia & Reading Railway Company, Petitioner
vs.
842

Monday, April 26th 1920, continued.

On Petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania and of the argument of Counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Philadelphia & Reading Railway Company, Petitioner,
vs.
Marie E. Polk.

On Petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

8464

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania and of the argument of Counsel thereupon had, as well in support of, as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be, and the

Monday, April 26th 1920, con

Per Mr. Chief Justice T

Lehigh Valley Railroad Company,
Petitioners,
vs.
Frederick W. Howell
Thomas A. Howell and
James N. Post, copartners
doing business under the
firm name of B.N. Howell,
Son and Company.
et al.

818

On
for w
certi
to the
of er
and
Pete
The
of N
J

On consideration of the Petit
a writ of certiorari herein to the
of Errors and Appeals of the St
New Jersey, and of the argum
counsel thereupon had, as well
support of, as against the sam
is now here ordered by this C
that the said petition be, and t
is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice

Lehigh Valley
Railroad Company,
Petitioner

819

vs.

Royal Indemnity

Monday, April 26th, 1920, continued

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Lehigh Valley Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. New York Plate Glass Insurance Company. — On writ of certiorari to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

No. 320

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Lehigh Valley Rail-
road Company,
Petitioner,
821 vs.
Chicago Bonding &
Insurance Company.

On [illegible]
for writ
certiora
the [illegible]
Error
appe
the St

New Jersey.

On consideration of the Peti
for a writ of certiorari herein t
Court of Error and Appeals of t
of New Jersey and of the argu
of counsel thereupon had, as
in support of as against the s
it is now here ordered by this
that the said petition be and th
same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice

Lehigh Valley Rail-
road Company,
Petitioner,
822 vs.
Ocean Accident Guarantee
Corporation, Limited of
London, England.
of New Jersey.

On
for
of C
to th
of E
and
Appe
the

On consideration of the Peti

Monday, April 26th 1920, continued

Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey and of the argument of Counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

823 Lehigh Valley Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Lloyds Plate Glass Insurance Company of New York. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, April 26th 1920, cont

Lehigh Valley Rail-
road Company,
Petitioner
824 vs.
Metropolitan Casualty
Insurance Company
of New York.

On Petit
for writ
certiora
to the C
of Error
and A
Seals o
the Stat

New Jersey.

On consideration of the Petit
for a writ of certiorari herein to th
Court of Errors and Appeals of
State of New Jersey and of the a
ment of counsel thereupon had,
well in support of as against
same it is now here ordered b
this Court that the said Petition
and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Lehigh Valley Rail-
road Company,
Petitioner,
825 vs.
Fidelity & Casualty
Company
of New Jersey.

On Petit
for wri
of certi
to the C
of Error
Appeal
for the

On consideration of the Petiti

Monday, April 26th 1920, (continued.)

Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey and of the argument of Counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

826 Lehigh Valley Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Commercial Casualty Insurance Company of Newark.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Monday, April 26th 1920, contin

827 Lehigh Valley Railroad Company, Petitioner vs. Childs Company, a corporation of New Jersey.

On Petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey, and of the argument of counsel thereupon as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby dismi

Per Mr. Chief Justice

828 Lehigh Valley Railroad Company, Petitioner vs. Trustees of St. Pauls' Evangelical Lutheran Church, Jersey.

On consideration of the Pet

Monday, April 26th 1929, continued.

Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

829 Lehigh Valley Rail-road Company Petitioner vs Eleazer Eldredge et al. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Errors and appeals of the State of New Jersey and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Monday April 26th 1920, cont

Lehigh Valley Rail-
road Company,
Petitioner
830 vs.
Ira N. Allen.

Seals of the State of New Jers

On consideration of the Pe
for a writ of certiorari herei
Court of Errors and Appeals
State of New Jersey and o
argument of counsel therei
had as well in support of a
against the same, it is now
ordered by this Court that t
petition be and the same is
denied.

Lee M. Chief Justice

On Petit
writ of
to the
States
Court
Seals

David G. Kline,
Petitioner
615 vs.
The United States
of America.

Eighth Circuit

On consideration of the
for a writ of certiorari here

Monday April 26th 1920, continued

Appeals of the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

767 The State of Louisiana, Petitioner, vs. William T. Joyce Company, et al. On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Monday, April 26th 1920, continued

782 Herman Bloch, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

786 E. A. King (and those who wish to intervene for their benefit) Petitioner vs. Robert N. Barr et al. for the Ninth Circuit. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals

On consideration of the petition

Monday, April 26th 1920, continued.

United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of, as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

797. Caramel Fruit Company, Petitioner vs. Johnson Iron Works Limited.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Monday, April 26th 1920, con

798. Gerhardt Wessels, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On pe for w certio to the States with t of Appeals for the Fifth Cir

On consideration of the p for a writ of certiorari here the United States Circuit C of Appeals for the Fifth Circ and of the argument of coun thereupon had as well in pe of as against the same it is here ordered by this Court that paid petition be, and the sa is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justic

800 Hunkley Company and Michigan Canning and Machinery Company, Petitioners, vs. Pasadena Canning Company and George E. Grier. — On p for w of C to the Uni Sta Cir Cou App

for the Ninth Circuit

tinued.

tition
rit of
ari
United
lein -
Court
ircuit.

Petition
n to
Court
cuit
sel
pport
now
the
ame

ri White

Petition
writ
ertiorari

ted
tes
ircuit
t of
Peals

Monday, April 26th 1920, continued

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

812

Herman Thoden et al
Petitioners,
vs.
The Union Pacific
Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Monday, April 26th 1920, continued.

816 Albert R. Houghton, Kinzea Stone, and Kinzea Stone as Executor of R. Andrew Hoover, deceased. (Petitioners, vs. Eugene R. Enslow et al.) — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

843 Philadelphia & Reading Railway Company (Petitioner vs. Annie Reynolds.) — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

Monday, April 26th 1920, continued.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

852 Freeman-Sweet Company, Petitioner, vs. Luminous Unit Company. the Seventh Circuit.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Monday, April 26th 1920, continued.

856 W. H. Ryan Towboat Company, Inc., Petitioner, vs. Carrie Shrader et al. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

857 Bowers Southern Dredging Company, Petitioner, vs. Carrie Shrader et al. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

Monday, April 26th 1920, Continued.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Chief Justice announced that the Court will take a recess from Monday, May 3, to Monday, May 17.

845 Ephraim Lederer, Collector &c., Petitioner, vs. Northern Trust Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Frierson for the petitioner and by Mr. William M. Stewart, Jr. for the respondents.

Monday, April 26th 1920, continued

657 Gertrude Groot
(Plaintiff in Error)
vs.
Caroline D. Reilly.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Mason N. Richardson and Mr. Edwin L. Wilson for the defendant in error in support of the motion and by Mr. W^m L. Prentiss for the Plaintiff in Error in opposition thereto.

653 Underwood Typewriter Company
(Plaintiff in Error)
vs.
Frederick S. Chamberlain, Treasurer, &c.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. W. M^c K. White Jr. in behalf of Mr Arthur L. Shipman for the Plaintiff in error in support of the motion and by Mr. Hugh M Alcorn for the defendant in error in opposition thereto.

781 Thomas H. Thomas,
(Petitioner)
vs.
South Butte Min-

Monday, April 26th 1920, continued

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles A. Beardsley for the petitioner and by Mr. John A. Shelton for the respondent.

789. Weber Electric Company, Petitioner, vs. E. A. Freeman Electric Company

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Neave for the petitioner and by Mr. Irving Lee Gifford and Mr. Edward P. Wolhaupter for the respondent.

847 Michigan Central Railroad Company, Petitioner vs. Mark Owen & Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ralph M. Shaw for the petitioner

Monday, April 26th 1920, continued.

853 C. T. Woremus,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States
of America

The petition for writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. A. Davies for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. W. C. Herron for the respondent.

875 Grace McMillan Gibson,
Petitioner
vs.
Ethel M. Gernat.

The petition for writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. D. McKenney, Mr. J. S. Flannery and Mr. G. Boardman Craighill for the petitioner and by Mr. Thomas S. Latta and Mr. Sidney F. Taliaferro for the respondent.

876 Inter-Urban Railway Company and London Guarantee & Accident Company,
Petitioners

Monday, April 26th 1920, continued

Mrs Thad Smith, On petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed.

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby dismissed,

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

John M. Le Crone, Receiver &c., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Wm. McAdoo, Secretary &c. 304

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George W. Baxter for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Solicitor General King for the respondent.

Daniel O'Connell et al, Plaintiffs in Error

Monday, April 26th 1920, continued

The United States of America. The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Gilbert E. Roe for the plaintiffs in error and concluded by Mr. Robert P. Stewart for the defendant in error.

795 William G. Street, Appellant, vs. Lincoln Safe Deposit Company, et al. This cause was argued by Mr. Joseph S. Auerbach and Mr. Charles H. Tuttle for the appellant and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Pierson for the appellees.

256 Samuel M. Scott et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Ida B. M. Booth. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. S. M. Langworthy for the plaintiffs in Error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, April 27th 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices
Frank H. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James H. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General King it is ordered that William E. Butler, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John A Barnes, it is ordered that George L. Schein

be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

618 First National Bank of Canton, Pennsylvania, Appellant, vs. John Skelton Williams, Comptroller, &c. the appellee. — Mandate granted on motion of Mr. Solicitor General King for

305 The Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Company, vs. Isabel N. Johnson. — This cause was continued per stipulation of counsel

306 National Life Insurance Company, &c., vs. A.M. Miller Administrator &c., — This cause was continued per stipulation of counsel.

308 Jane Field, Appellant, vs. The United States. — This cause was continued per Stipulation of Counsel.

Tuesday, April 27th 1920, continued.

Samuel N. Scott et al,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Ida B. N. Booth.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. A. M. Laughworthy for the plaintiffs in error, by Mr. Le. W. Prince for the defendant in error and concluded by Mr. Jackson W. Ralston for the plaintiffs in Error. Leave granted to file additional brief on motion of Mr. A. M. Laughworthy for the plaintiffs in error.

Bartholomew Sullivan et al.
Appellants,
vs.
Jane Kidd.

This cause was argued by Mr. A. M. Laughworthy for the appellees, and submitted by Mr. B. I. Litowich and Mr. George A. Beatty for the appellants.

George C. Beidler,
Appellant,
vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Charles J. Williamson for the appellant and continued by Mr. Samuel L. Morris for the appellee. Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve

Wednesday, April 28th 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

317 Lillian Nicchia
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The People of the State of New York.

This cause was continued per stipulation of counsel.

260 George C. Beidler
Appellant,
vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Claude

Wednesday, April 28th 1920, continued.

cluded by Mr. Charles J. Williamson for the appellant.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error,
292. vs.
Harry C. Wheeler et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. W. C. Herron for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the defendants in error.

Edward A. Shedd, et al., Appellants,
231 vs.
Guardian Trust Company et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. J. C. Rosenberger for the appellants and by Mr. Charles W. German and Mr. J. D. Bowersock for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Thursday, April 29th 1920 —

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices
Frank H. Green Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Kuig, it is ordered that Leo Goldberger, Esquire of Perth Amboy, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Timothy S. Hogan it is ordered that Bert M. Goodhart Esquire of Columbus, State

of Ohio be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor at this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter H. Burns, it is ordered that Selbie D Grove Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur J. Voyp, it is ordered that Wilbur E Benoy Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Kenneth H. McKellar, it is ordered that Prather S. McDonald, Esquire of Memphis State of Tennessee be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States
of America

841 Petitioner, vs. Aetna Explosives Company. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Hanson for the petitioner.

625 Lillian B. Pembleton, Petitioner vs. Illinois Commercial Mens Association. On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion it is now here ordered, adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States of America ex rel Jennie Johnson, et al

Thursday, April 29th continued.

291 Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
John Barton Payne,
Secretary of the Interior.

This cause was argued by Mr. Charles H. Merillat for the plaintiffs in error and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Nebeker for the defendant in error.

Creamo of Wheat Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
302 The County of Grand Forks, North Dakota.

This cause was argued by Mr. Harry S. Larson and Mr. Rome G. Brown for the plaintiffs in Error and by Mr. Albert E. Shute, Jr., and Mr. George E. Wallace for the defendants in error.

William Thuax et al, &c.
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
307 Michael Corrigan et al,

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Clifton Matthews for the plaintiffs in Error and continued by Mr. Jackson H. Ralston for the defendants in error.

Thursday, April 29th 1920 continued.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Friday, April 30th 1920, continued

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James Clark McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.

Frank H. Green Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry E. Davis it is ordered that Dallas Townsend Esquire and Samuel Conrad Cohen, Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry E.

William J. Hudson Esquire of Safford, State of Arizona be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank M. Hackett, it is ordered that Henry Selden Bacon, Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

307 William Thuax et al &c., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Michael Corrigan et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Jackson & Alston for the and Mr. Samuel Herrick for the defendants in error and concluded by Mr. Clifton Matthews for the Plaintiffs in error.

310 James K. Perrine, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Oklahoma ex rel John Embry &c

Friday, April 30th, 1920, continued.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. M. McAdams, for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. S. T. Dreling and Mr. W. C. Hall for the defendant in error.

Kwock Jan Dak, Petitioner,
vs.
Edward White Commissioner of Immigration &c.

This cause was argued by Mr. Jackson H. Ralston for the petitioner and submitted by Assistant Attorney General S. Riggsby Clerwork and Mr. Harry for the respondent.

Daniel J. Leary et al, Administrators, Appellants,
vs.
The United States of America

This cause was argued by Mr. Aubrey E. Strode for the appellants and by Mr. Marion Er-

for the appellee.

The United States Appellant,
vs.

320 North American Transportation and Trading Company, and North American Transportation and Trading Company, Defendant, vs. The United States.

This c
was d
by Mr
E. Ba
for th
Amer
Trans
Trad
and C
Assis
Attor
Gener
Claims for the United States.

321 Wells Brothers Company of New York, Appellant, vs. The United States.

This
was
mitte
the c
judi
of the
by Mr. A. R. Sinnen and Mr
E. Barlow for the appellan
by Mr Assistant Attorney G
Claims for the appellee!

324 Robert H. Kinney, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Plymouth Rock Squab Company.

Friday, April 30th 1920, continued.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert H. Kinney Pro se. No appearance for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at twelve o'clock.

Monday, May 3d 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green Esquire Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. A. Horton it is ordered that Leon Fraser, Esquire of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Brinson, it is ordered that John Higgins, Jr., Esquire, of Uniontown, State of Pennsylvania, and D. Keith Leslie

Monday, May 3d 1920, continued.

Esquire of Alexandria, State of Virginia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. M.F. Phelan, it is ordered that Edward E. Reardon, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis A. Brogan, it is ordered that Conan Raymond Esquire, of Omaha State of Nebraska be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Kuig it is ordered that Franklin J. Wilson, Esquire of Washington District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles J. Sturtevant it is ordered that Marcel E. Cerf, Esquire and Charles N. Goody, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander Britton it is ordered that Ward Thurston Clotfelter, Esquire of Los Angeles State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Oberlin Paca it is ordered that H. Earl Simpson, Esquire of Cleveland, State of Ohio be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Melendez Ruiz, it is ordered that Ethelbert T. Barbour, of El Reno, State of Oklahoma be

admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry H. Williams it is ordered that William E. Hayne, Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Addison P. Smith it is ordered that George H. Lowe, Esquire of St. Anthony, State of Idaho, and Irvin E. Kerr, Esquire of Detroit, State of Michigan be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. G. Carroll Todd, it is ordered that C. M. Taylor, Esquire of Austin, State of Texas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

683 George Wallace, Albert A. Olsen Carl R. Koritz Ky et al, Appellants, vs. Walker D. Hines Director General of Railroads Northern Pacific Railway Company et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of North Dakota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of North Dakota and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered ~~and~~ adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court of the United States in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. ~~Chief~~ Justice Holmes

726 Sarah A. Whittemore, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Maud B. Crawford.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause be and the same is hereby postponed until the

hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Gertrude Groot, Plaintiff in Error,
v.
Caroline D. Reilly.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause be, and the same is hereby postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Underwood Typewriter Company, Plaintiff in Error,
v.
Frederick S. Chamberlain, Treasurer of the State of Connecticut.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday October 11th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

789. Weber Electric Company, Petitioner vs. E. N. Freeman Electric Company. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States for the Third Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

841 The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. Aetna Explosive Company. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States ~~Circuit~~ Court of Customs Appeals.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs Appeals and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in

it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

847 Michigan Central Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Mark Owen & Company. On Petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

781 Thomas L. Thomas, Petitioner, vs. South Butte Mining Company. On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals of the Ninth Circuit.

On petition for a writ of cer
herein to the United States Circuit
of Appeals for the Ninth Circu
of the argument of counsel therein
had as well in support of as ag
the same, it is now here ordered
this Court that the said petition
and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

845

Ephraim Jeduer,
Collector of Internal
Revenue,
Petitioner
vs.
Northern Trust Com-
pany and Henry R.
Zeisinger, Executors
under the will of Lewis
M. Klahr, deceased.

On consideration of the petition
a writ of certiorari herein to the
States Circuit Court of Appeal
for the Third Circuit and of the
ment of counsel thereupon had as
in support of as against the re
it is now here ordered by this C
that the said petition be, and
same is hereby denied

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

853 C. D. Coremus,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States
of America.

On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

875 Grace McMillan Gibson,
Petitioner,
vs.
Ethel M. Gernat.

On Petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in

is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

633 Fred W. Weitzel, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States. The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the defendant in error in support of the motion and by Mr. A. E. Stricklett for the Plaintiff in Error in opposition thereto.

27 Orig. The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, vs. The State of Texas. Leave granted to file response of The State of Texas to the motions for leave to intervene and for a modification of the order of April 1st 1920, on motion of Mr. C. W. Taylor for the defendant.

370 J. Hartley Manners, Petitioner, vs. Oliver Morosco. The motion to modify the decree herein was submitted by Mr Alex-

Monday, May 3d 1920, continued

under & King in behalf of Mr David Gerber and Mr. William J. Hughes for the petitioner with leave to counsel for respondent to file brief & opposition on or before Friday next.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, vs. The State of Texas. — Leave granted to file Response of The United States to

motions for leave to intervene and for a modification of the order of April 1st 1920, on motion of Mr. Solicitor General King for The United States.

The County of Douglas, Plaintiff in Error, vs. George Warren Smith. — The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Francis Brogan and Mr. A. E. Ellick for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. William & Lamb for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

John C. Heald et al, &c.,
855 vs.
The District of Columbia.

The m
for al
of cer
to brin
the wh

record and cause, and to advanc
submitted to the consideration of
Court by Mr. A.S. Worthington
Mr. Vernon E. West, for Heald
al, &c., in support of the motion

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
869. vs.
The State of Alabama.

The Pe
for a
of cer
herein
submit
to the C

sideration of the Court by Mr Le
Henry Butler in behalf of Mr. H
V. Lindabury, for the Petitioner a
by Mr Lawrence E Brown and Mr
J.L. Smith for the respondent.

Commercial Credit Company et al,
Petitioners,
865. vs.
Continental Trust Company.

The P
for a
of cer
herein
submi
to the
sidera

of the Court by Mr. Alexander W

Monday, May 3d 1920, continued.

Smith for the petitioners and by Mr. Harris Grice and Mr. Robert C. Alston for the respondent.

The Backstay Machine & Leather Company, Petitioner, vs. Helen Wade Hamilton. 848 & 849.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry H. Williams and Mr. Frederic H. McKenney for the petitioner and by Mr. W. Orison Underwood for the respondent.

Jeanette M. Lee, Petitioner, vs. Richard C. Minor as Trustee, &c., et al. 861.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel Herrick and Mr. R. C. Heflron for the petitioner and by Mr. John M. Miller for the respondent.

Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs 888

Monday, May 3d 1920, continued

Alfred Steidler, The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. D. McKenney and Mr. A. L. Wall and Mr. John A. Hartpence for the petitioner and by Mr. Alex Simpson for the respondent.

Emily McDowell, petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 840 The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Marshall B. Woodworth for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. W. C. Herron for the respondent.

Texas and Gulf Steamship Company, petitioner, vs. Clarence Parker and Hill, Cook & Pope. 850 The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William B. Lockhart for the petitioner.

The Buckeye Company (Ohio) Petitioner, vs. Minnesota Stove Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry C. Howard and Mr. Fred L. Chappell for the petitioner and by Mr. Walter H. Chamberlin for the respondent.

The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Mrs. Minnie Owens, Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Willard R. Bleakmore, Mr. C. O. Blake and Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage for the petitioner

Charles Kollman, Petitioner vs. The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr.

and Mr. Chester J. Gerkin for the petitioner.

889. The Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Charles S. Caudee, Jr. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick B. Scott for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday 17th at 12 o'clock, subject to amending on an intervening day should the public business require it.

Monday, May 17th 1920.—

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present.

The Honorable Edward D. White Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.

Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green Esquire, Marshal,
James H. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward E. Brown, it is ordered that George N. Lidbert Esquire, of Nauvau, and John Kimball Parish, Esquire of Ashland, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. H. Parish, it is ordered that E.

Simmang, Esquire, of Geddings; J. P. Buchanan Esquire of Brenham; George A. Smoot Esquire of Wichita Falls; and Walter S. Pope Esquire of Anson, State of Texas be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John N. McCluffie it is ordered that William Hugh McEniry Esquire of Bessemer, State of Alabama be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W M A Stevenson it is ordered that Legaré Walker Esquire of Summerville and Richard S. Whaley Esquire of Charleston, State of South Carolina be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Saldwin Flannery it is ordered

That Edward Burling, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and J. Harry Covington, Esquire, of Easton, State of Maryland be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler it is ordered that Frank P. Doherty, Esquire of Los Angeles, State of California; Walter D. Seay, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas; Richard H. Hill, Esquire, of New Castle, State of Kentucky; Horace Manford Mayes, Esquire, of Jonesboro, State of Arkansas; and N. M. Huskey, Esquire, of Reno, State of Nevada, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry S. Monell, it is ordered that John St. Agate, Esquire, of Pittsford State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hubert D. Fisher, it is ordered that Frank Roberson Esquire, of Jackson, and Thomas M. Davis, Esquire of Purvis, State of Mississippi be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Oscar M. Underwood, it is ordered that Isadore Shapiro, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joe T. Robinson it is ordered that H. D. Glover, Esquire of Malvern State of Arkansas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn according ly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas J. Walsh it is ordered that Arthur St. Brown Esquire of Billings

and Charles J. Marshall, Esquire, of Lewiston, State of Montana be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. N. C. Telephane, it is ordered that Logan M. Rock, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis Crandon it is ordered that Aldrich Baxter, Esquire of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. P. M. Shelps, it is ordered that John A. Harries, Esquire of Williamsport, State of Pennsylvania be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was

Sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. P. Freling it is ordered that A. M. Beets, Esquire and J. L. Carpenter, Esquire of Oklahoma City and B. A. Lewis, Esquire of Bartlesville, State of Oklahoma be admitted to practice as ~~an~~ attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph Millerson, it is ordered that Walter Thomas, Esquire of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George E. Chamberlain it is ordered that John N. Layne, Esquire of Chicago, Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. D. Sullivan, it is ordered that James G. Glasener, Esquire, of York, State of Pennsylvania be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline it is ordered that John Taylor Booz, Esquire of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. N. Parrish it is ordered that Reuben Miller Holland, Esquire of Owensboro, and W. K. Kincheloe, Esquire of Madisonville, State of Kentucky be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

E. N. Bliss Company, Appellant, vs. The United States. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

940

Monday, May 17th 1920, contin

This cause came on to be he
the Transcript of the record from
Court of Claims and was arg
by counsel.

On consideration whereof, t
now here ordered and adjudged
this Court that the judgment
said Court of Claims in this c
be, and the same is hereby a
Per Mr. Justice Clarke

684

Piedmont Power and Light Company, Appellant, v. The Town of Graham et al.

Appe
the U
Court
United
for the
on
of No

Carolina.

This cause came on to be hear
the transcript of the record from
District Court of the United St
for the Western District of Nor
lina and was argued by co

On consideration whereof, i
now here ordered, adjudged and
reed by this Court That this a
be, and the same is hereby, dis
for the want of jurisdiction.
Per Mr. Justice Clarke

J. R. Paschall 2nd
Warner Moore
Appellants,
685 vs.
The Town of Graham
et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of North Carolina and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr Justice Clarke.

C. C. Calhoun,
Petitioner,
294 vs.
Blaud Masie.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of

Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia and was argued by counsel

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds,
Mr. Justice McKenna
Mr. Justice VanDevanter
Mr. Justice Pitney.

Sue Erskine Newman, Administratrix of the Estate of Ursula Ragland Erskine, deceased, David F. Houston, Secretary of the Treasury, and John Burke, Treasurer of the United States, Appellants,
vs.
Ida M. Moyers, and Charles T. Consault, Partners, trading as Moyers and Consault.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia

85

Monday, May 17th 1920, continued.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause as to appellants Houston and Burke be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said Court of Appeals with directions to reverse the decree of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia and to remand the cause to that Court with directions to dismiss the bill as to them.

It is further ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the appeal of Newman, administratrix, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of prosecution; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Monday, May 17th 1920, continued

187

Meccano Limited,
Petitioner,
vs.
John Wanamaker,
New York.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds

Daniel O'Connell,
Howard J. Smith,
Herman B Smith,
Carl J. D. Wacker,
Thomas Carey and
E. R. Hoffman
for petitioner.

Charles Evans Hughes,
Solicitor General,
for respondent.

221 vs. The United States of America, } In error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Knickerbocker Ice Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Lillian E. Stewart } In error to the Supreme Court, Appellate Division, Third Department, of the State of New York.

543

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court

ment of the State of New York, and was argued by Counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Holmes
Mr. Justice Pitney
Mr. Justice Brandeis
Mr. Justice Clarke.

137

E. B. Miller (Plaintiff in Error)
vs.
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit

This cause came on to be heard

the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of Error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

E B Miller
Plaintiff in Error,
v.
Chicago and Eastern Illinois Railroad Company.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

138

This cause came on to be heard on the Transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

139. E. B. Stiller, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Chicago and Alton Railroad Company. In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of Error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney

140 E B Stiller Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Missouri Pacific Railway Company. In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court

and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney

E B Miller
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Company.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

141

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney

E B Miller
Plaintiff in Error

St Louis and San Fran-
cisco Railroad Com-
pany,
for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be
the transcript of the record f
United States Circuit Court
Appeals for the Eighth Circ
~~of the argument of counsel t~~
~~had, as well in support of~~
argued by counsel!

On consideration whereo
now here ordered by this Co
the writ of error in this cau
and the same is hereby dis
for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Pitne

E. B. Sellers,
Plaintiff in Error,
143 vs.
Chicago, Rock Island
and Pacific Railway
Company.

In
the
Stat
cuit
App
the
Cir

This cause came on to be h
on the transcript of the rec
from the United States Cir
of Appeals for the Eighth

and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of Error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

E B Diller,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
144 Illinois Central Railroad Company.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the writ of Error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

E B Diller,
Plaintiff in Error,
145

Missouri, Kansas and Texas Railway Company.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

137. E B Miller, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Atchison Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company;

138 E B Miller, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Chicago and Eastern Illinois Railway Company

Monday, May 17th, 1920

E. B. Spiller,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Chicago and Alton Rail-
road Company;

E. B. Spiller,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The Missouri Pacific
Railway Company;

E. B. Spiller,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
St. Louis, Iron Mountain
& Southern Railway
Company;

E. B. Spiller
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
St. Louis and San
Francisco Railroad
Company;

E. B. Spiller,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Chicago Rock Island
& Pacific Railway Company;

144 E. B. Miller,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Illinois Central
Railroad Company;
and
E. B. Miller,
Plaintiff in Error,
145 vs.
Missouri, Kansas,
& Texas Railway
Company.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein
It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted, the transcript of record heretofore filed on the return to the writs of error to stand as a return to the writ of certiorari.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

137 E. B. Miller,
Petitioner,
vs.
Atchison, Topeka
and Santa Fe Railway
Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

E.B. Schiller,
Petitioner,
138. vs.
Chicago and
Eastern Illinois
Railroad Company.

Judgment entered May 17th

Monday, May 17th 1920, continued

E B Spiller,
Petitioner
139. vs.
Chicago and Alton
Railroad Company.

Judgment same as No. 137.

E B Spiller,
Petitioner
140 vs.
The Missouri Pacific
Railway Company.

Judgment same as No 137.

E B Spiller,
Petitioner
141. vs.
St Louis Iron Moun-
tain & Southern Rail
way Company.

Judgment same as No. 137.

E B Spiller,
Petitioner
142. vs.
St Louis and San Fran-
cisco Railroad Company.

Judgment same as No. 137.

Monday, May 17th 1920, Continued.

E B Spiller,
Petitioner,
vs
Chicago, Rock Island
& Pacific Railway
Company,

Judgment same as No. 137.

E B Spiller
Petitioner
vs.
Illinois Central Rail-
road Company,

Judgment same as No. 137.

E B Spiller,
Petitioner.
vs.
Missouri Kansas
and Texas Railway
Company.

Judgment same as No. 137.

Western Union Tele-
graph Company
Petitioner
vs.

Executor of the last will & Testament of William Lange, Jr, deceased and J.E. Hastings.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

The United States of America and the Interstate Commerce Commission

Monday, May 17th, 1920, continued.

541. Appellants, vs. Alaska Steamship Company et al. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

Daniel J. Leary and George Leary, Administrators of James D. Leary, deceased, Appellants,

344 vs.

The United States of America. — Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Virginia.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Chicago, Milwaukee & St Paul Railway Company, Petitioner

vs.

McCaull-Dinsmore Company, vs. States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit. On writ of certiorari to the United

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting: Mr. Chief Justice White.

Erie Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. William M. Collins. On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Ap-

the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Van Devanter.
Mr. Justice Pitney.

355. Erie Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Antoni Szary. On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard

the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Van Devanter,
Mr. Justice Pitney.

Edward White, Commissioner of Immigration for the Port of San Francisco, Petitioner

vs.

Chin Bong.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court

and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna

Great Northern Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
J. C. Cahill and George Redman co-partners as Redman & Cahill, and The Board of Railroad Commissioners of the State of South Dakota.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of South Dakota.

12 Dec

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Dakota and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is

by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Edward A. Shead et al
Appellants,
vs.
Guardian Trust Com
pany, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Monday, May 17th 1920, continued

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

437 The County of Douglas in the State of Nebraska, Plaintiff in Error, vs. George Warren Smith. In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and was argued by counsel on motion to dismiss which

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

324 Robert McKinney, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Plymouth Rock Squab Company, of Massachusetts. In error to the District Court of the United States for the District

Monday, May 17th 1920, (continued.)

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error, ~~said District Court~~ in this cause, be and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

James K. Perrine
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The State of Oklahoma ex rel. John Embry, County Attorney.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

310

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error, in this cause, be and the same

of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

256 Samuel M. Scott, James D. Burney, Leon M. Schwabb, et al, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Ida B. M. Booth

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr Chief Justice White.

633. Fred M. Weitzel, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky

Monday, May, 17th 1920, continued).

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

J. Hartley Manners, Petitioner, vs. Oliver Morosco.

On consideration of the motion to modify the decree in this case.

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is, hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

John C. Neald, George Hamilton and Milton J. Lambert

and Estate of Eugene Peters.

855. vs.

The District of Columbia

It is ordered by the Court that the motion for a writ of certiorari to bring up the entire record and cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Emily McFour, Petitioner.

840 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

The Backstay Machine and Leather Company, Petitioner,
848 & 849 vs.
Helen Wade Hamilton.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Texas and Gulf Steamship Company, Petitioner,
850 vs.
Clarence Parker and Still, Cook and Pope.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to

The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

860

The Beckwith Company (formerly The Estate of P. B. Beckwith, Inc.) Petitioner, vs. Minnesota Stove Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Jeannette H. Lee,
Petitioner,
vs.
Richard C. Minor,
as Trustee under the
will of Elizabeth E.
Barnhart, deceased,
and Richard C. Minor.

On petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Commercial Credit
Company, and
Salisbury Metal
Culvert Company,
Petitioners
vs.
Continental Trust Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the

United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

868

Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner

vs.

Mrs. Minnie Owens, Administratrix of the Estate of E. E. Owens, deceased.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. The State of Alabama. 869

On Petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Charles Kollman, Petitioner, vs. The United States. 873

On Petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Monday, May 17th 1920, continued

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

888 The Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Alfred Stiedler. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Errors and Appeals for the State of New Jersey.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1. The United States of America, Appellant, vs. Lehigh Valley Railroad Company et al. It is ordered by the Court that this case be restored to the docket for oral argument.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Bartholomew Sullivan et al,

Appellants,
vs.
Jane Kidd

It is ordered by the Court that this case be restored to the docket for oral argument, and the Clerk is directed to notify the Attorney General of the United States and the Attorney General of the State of Kansas of the pendency of this case.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Chief Justice also announced that the Court will adjourn for the term on Monday, June 7th next.

Order:

The Reporter having represented that owing to the number of decisions at the present term it would be impracticable to put the reports in one volume,

It is, therefore, now here ordered that he publish an additional volume this year pursuant to Section 226 of the Judicial Code, approved March 3, 1911.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,

Monday, May 17th 1920, continued.

The State of Texas. The motion for leave to file proofs in support of its responses to the applications for leave to intervene and for modification of the order granting injunction and appointing receiver herein, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the United States.

34 Franklin K. Lane, Secretary &c., et al., Appellants, vs. Central Pacific Railway Company. Leave granted to substitute as one of the appellants John Barton Payne, present Secretary of the Interior, in the place of Franklin K. Lane, former Secretary thereof, on motion of Mr. Solicitor General King for the appellants.

35 The Northern Pacific Railway Company, Appellant, vs. Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior. Leave granted to substitute as party appellee John Barton Payne present Secretary of the Interior, in the place of Franklin K. Lane former Secretary thereof, on

Monday, May 17th 1920, continued.

motion of Mr. Solicitor General King
for the appellee.

Franklin K. Lane,
Secretary of the Interior
et al.,
Appellants,
vs.
The State of New Mexico.

Leave granted
to substitute
as one of
the appellants
John Barton
Payne,
present
Secretary of the Interior, in the place of
Franklin K. Lane, former Secretary
thereof on motion of Mr. Solicitor General
King for the appellants.

The United States of
America ex rel C.E.
Keys,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Franklin K. Lane, Secre-
tary of the Interior.

Leave granted
to substitute
as defendant
in error John
Barton Payne
present Secre-
tary of the
Interior, in
place of Franklin K. Lane, former
Secretary thereof on motion of Mr.
Solicitor General King for the defendant
in error.

Charles E. Smith,
Appellant,
vs.

Kansas City Title & Trust Company et al. — The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander B. King in behalf of Mr. William Marshall Bullitt and Mr. Frank Hagerman and of Mr. George H. Wickersham and Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the appellee.

627 — The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Demitrios J. Theophilatos et al. — The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr Solicitor General King for the Plaintiff in Error.

779 and 780 — The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. National Surety Company. — The motion to advance herein was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General King for the Petitioner

Monday, May 17th, 1920, continued.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. L. Cohen Grocery Company, Plaintiff in Error.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Kuig for the

William E. Johnson, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Maryland.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General King for the Plaintiff in Error.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. James Butt, alias Wong Sing.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the Plaintiff in Error.

John Barton Payne, Secretary of the Interior et al., Appellants,

412 The State of New Mexico. vs. The State of Wyoming, et al, and The United States of America. Appellants, vs. The United States of America. — The motion herein to advance for argument after case No. 34 was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General King for the Appellants.

742 The United States of America, Appellant, vs. Northern Pacific Railway Company. — The motion to advance this case for argument with case No. 35, was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General King for the Appellant.

909 Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner, vs. Beech Nut Packing Company. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Alexander

916

C. King and Mr. Claude R. Porter for the petitioner.

Western Union Telegraph Company, Petitioner,
712. vs.
Addie Speight.

The motion to place this cause on the Summary Docket was submitted to the Court by Mr. Francis Raymond Stark, Mr Charles H. Dillett and Mr. Thomas Guthrie for the petitioner.

Henry S. McKee, Appellant,
931. vs.
David Costaguta et al. &c., et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Frederick M. Ozaki and Mr. Marian Erwin for the appellant in support of the same and by Mr. Walter H. Merritt in opposition thereto.

The Missouri Pacific Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error,
765 vs.
McGraw Coal Company

The motion to vacate supersedeas herein was submitted

by Mr. Edwin A. Knauthoff in support of the same, and Mr. Edward J. White and Mr. James R. Grew, in opposition thereto.

No. — John N. Claridge vs. Leo Simmons. The Petition of John N. Claridge for the allowance of a writ of error herein was submitted by Mr. Charles Brown for the Petitioner.

27 Orig'l. The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, vs. The State of Texas. The motion of Mrs. Lillie Morgan and others for leave to present oral argument on their motion to dissolve the injunction &c., herein was submitted by Mr. A. H. Carrigan in that behalf.

898. Hiram M. Stancil et al., Petitioners, vs. Frederick Leyland & Company, Ltd., Claimant &c., et al. The Petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. F. S. Tyler and Mr. John H. Grace for the Petitioner.

Sarah Mary Hall,
Administratrix, &c.,
Plaintiff in Error,
705 vs.
Chesapeake and Ohio
Railway Company.

The motion for leave to omit parts of record in printing submitted by Mr. H.

Prescott Gatley on behalf of Mr. A. M. Buckley and Mr. C. E. Moore for the Plaintiff in Error in support of the motion and by Mr. North E. Taylor for the defendant in error in opposition thereto.

The Chesapeake Steamship Company, &c.,
Owner, &c., et al.,
Petitioners
885 vs.
Frank Hand, Master
of the British Steamship
"Hawkhead."

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Floyd Hughes for the petitioners and by Mr. R. M. Hughes, Jr., for the respondent.

In the matter of the petition of Edward E. Blodgett, Chairman, &c.,

Petition as to revision of rules in admiralty submitted by Mr.

Floyd Hughes in behalf of Mr. Blodgett, and by Mr. Robert M. Hughes in support of the petition.

27 Orig'l — The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, vs. The State of Texas. — The motion of the Judsonia Development Association for an order upon receiver directing him to turn over possession of its property now held by him as receiver, to said association was submitted by Mr. Jesse E. Roote in that behalf.

862 — Hannah D. Wilson, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Curtis McDonnell. — The motion to dismiss herein was submitted by Mr. Leon Dobriner and Mr. Levi M. Hlavid for the defendant in error in support of the motion and by Mr. Henry E. Davis for the plaintiff in Error in opposition thereto.

570 — John P. Monahue, Appellant, vs. Helen May Monahue, alias Helen May Huskey.

The motion to dismiss herein was submitted by Mr. H. M. Huskey for the appellee in support of the motion and by Mr. George C. Otto for the appellant in opposition thereto.

Philadelphia and Reading Railway Company, Petitioner,
900 vs.
Amy Smith.
For the petitioner.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. George Gowen Parry.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
27 Orig'l vs.
The State of Texas.

The Report of the Receiver was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Spalding Flannery for the Receiver.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
27 Orig'l vs.
The State of Texas.

Leave granted to file suggestions as to report of receiver

on motion of Mr. H. A. Ledbetter in behalf of Motion to modify order appointing receiver submitted by Mr. H. [illegible]

bitter and Mr. H.L. Stuart of counsel for the Oklahoma Petroleum & Gasoline Company et al.

907 Arnold Jacob Uhl, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. H.A. Wenson for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. W. Osterson for the respondent with leave to petitioner to file reply brief in ten days.

707 United Mine Workers of America et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Coronado Coal Company et al. The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. R.B. Hull, Mr. Henry S. Drinker Jr., and Mr. James B. McKenney for the defendants in error.

708 J.H. Purcell, et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The City of Lexington ex rel Thomas E. Coyne, Tax assessor. The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted by Mr. Jesse D. Miller and Mr. Harry B.

Miller for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. George C. Webb and Mr. George R. Hunt for the Plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

887 El Paso & Southwestern Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Robert L. Lockk.

The motion to ~~dismiss~~ or affirm or transfer to the Summary docket herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. J. Curtis and Mr. Winbourn Pearce for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. William R. Harr and Mr. W. A. Hawkins & Mr. Charles N. Bates for the Plaintiffs in Error in opposition thereto.

~~130~~ 130 Boston West Africa Trading Company, Petitioner vs. Quaker City Morocco Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lee McFriedman for the petitioner and by Mr. Wm L. Putman for the respondent.

839 G. N. Bouldin,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States
of America.

The petition for
a writ of
certiorari herein
was submitted
by Mr. George
N. Hewitt for
the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant
Attorney General Stewart and Mr.
Harry S. Ridgely, for the respondent.

851 National Surety
Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
Jefferson County in
the State of Miss-
issippi.

The petition for
a writ of cer-
tiorari herein
was submitted
to the con-
sideration
of the Court
by Mr. John
R. Dyson for the petitioner and by
Mr. R. H. McBee for the respondent.

863 Samuel L. Snyderson,
Petitioner
vs.
The United States
of America.

The petition
for a writ
of certiorari
herein was
submitted
by Mr. Wm.
Shaw McCallum for the petitioner
and by Mr. Assistant Attorney
General Stewart and Mr. Frank Ellis
G. Wilson for the respondent.

871 Henry Albers, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.

The petition for writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Charles H. Carey and Mr. James B. Kerr for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

872 W. W. Wheeler, Petitioner, vs. Charles P. Taft et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. G. P. Bullis for the petitioner and by Mr. Henry J. Livingston for the respondents.

880 F. H. Oraith & Son Company et al., Petitioners, vs. National Credit & Trust Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. Musgrave and Mr. Wm. S. Oppenheim for the petitioners, and by Mr. James H. Hughes for the respondent.

891. Anthony Phillips, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. The
a w
here
sub
Ma
T. S

The Petitioner and by Mr. Attorney General Stewart a Franklin G. Wilson, for the

914 Curaco Trading Company, &c., Petitioner, vs. Carl Bjorge master and claimant &c. The
ar
or
w
by
M

Mr. Monte Mclemann for the and by Mr. William Waller the respondent.

946 John S. Randolph Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America. In
he
of
S
W
tr

York.

It appearing to the Co a motion of counsel for the in error to dismiss the wr

tinued.

Petition for
rit of certiorari
in was
bmitted by
r. Frederick
Sawsey for
Assistant
nd Mr.
respondent.

e petition for
writ of certi-
ari herein
as submitted
y Mr. J Blanc
Monroe and
petitioner
Young for

r error to the
District Court
the United
States for the
Northern Dis-
rict of Neu

urt that
plaintiff
f of error

Monday, May 17th 1920, continued

in this cause has been filed,

Therefore in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Tuesday, June 1st next at twelve o'clock.

Tuesday June 1st 1920

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr Assistant Attorney General Frierson it is ordered that John E. Little Esquire, of Charlotte, State of North Carolina; Daniel H. Morgan, Esquire, of Cookeville State of Tennessee and W. L. Walls, Esquire, of Cheyenne, State of Wyoming, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

Tuesday, June 1st 1920, continued.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wm O'Beall, it is ordered that Bower S. Broaddus, Esquire, and James N. Cosgrove, Esquire of Muskogee State of Oklahoma be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Don D. McKeown it is ordered that N. V. Pryor Esquire of Sapulpa, State of Oklahoma be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Earl R. Chrisbloom it is ordered that George Walter Johnson, Esquire of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A.A. Hoehling, it is ordered that Anthony J. Griffin, Esquire of Red Lodge

Eby Neumann, Esquire, and Reese H. Alsop, Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. B. Ames, it is ordered that Edward P. Brown, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick Stiles, it is ordered that Charles H. Morgan, Esquire, of New York City; R. H. Price, Esquire of Birmingham, State of Alabama and F. M. Andreani, Esquire of Los Angeles, State of California be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Knute Nelson, it is ordered that A. E. Crossfield, Esquire, of Manila,

Philippine Islands be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wallace Humphrey it is ordered that James Dick, Esquire, of Jackson, Clinton C. McCormick, Esquire of Wellston, State of Ohio and Joseph Beal, Esquire, of Albany, State of Newyork, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. H. Price, it is ordered that Junius L. Powell, Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. O. Stanley it is ordered that M. E. Tyler, Esquire of Covington, State of Kentucky be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor

of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles M. Needham it is ordered that Walter R McFarland, Esquire of Washington District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. M. Jeffries it is ordered that Thomas B Murray Esquire of Omaha, State of Nebraska be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he has sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R M Yeatman it is ordered that H Howard Evans, Esquire of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, Edward J. Katzinback, Esquire of Trenton, State of New Jersey, and Paul M. Ashbaugh Esquire of Mt. Vernon, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly

Tuesday, June 1st 1920, continued.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry Ashurst it is ordered that Jacob J. Leberman Esquire, of Denver State of Colorado, and Thomas D. Flynn Esquire, of Phoenix, State of Arizona be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter Magee it is ordered that Edward Hunt, Esquire, and William H. Sawtry, Esquire, of Oneida State of New York be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hawk E. Horemus it is ordered that Walter Phillips, Esquire, of Detroit State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney an counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clement Brumbaugh it is ordered

that John A.W. Schmidt Esquire of Washington District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joe T. Robenson, it is ordered that E.J. McHaney Esquire of Little Rock, State of Arkansas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Walsh, it is ordered that John J. Fisher Esquire of Bay field, State of Wisconsin be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert C Evans, it is ordered that William Boyd Hunter Esquire of San Francisco, State of California be admitted to practice as an

attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. D. Worthington it is ordered that Albert Harper Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James Quarles it is ordered that Alexander Galt Barret, Esquire of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. M. Gregory it is ordered that W. A. Keeling Esquire of Austin, State of Texas be admitted to practice as attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the

Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles D. Wilson it is ordered that Hayden B. Garrick, Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

28 Orig. Ex Parte In the Matter of Walter Peterson as Receiver of the Interstate Coal Company, Petitioner,

On consideration of the petition for writs of prohibition and/or mandamus herein, of the return to the rule to show cause, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had.

It is now here ordered by the Court that the rule to show cause be, and the same is hereby discharged and the petition for writs of prohibition and/or mandamus denied.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

301 The Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Kittanning Iron and Steel Manufacturing Company,

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

Tuesday, June 1st 1920, continued

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Cream of Wheat Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The County of Grand Forks, in the State of North Dakota. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Dakota.

302

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Dakota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof It is

this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The United States
Appellant,
vs.
The North American Transportation and Trading Company,

and

The North American Transportation and Trading Company,
Appellant
vs.
The United States.

319 and 320.

Appeals from the Court of Claims

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims on appeal and cross-appeal and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be and the same is hereby affirmed

534 Leslie C. Stallings, Appellant, vs. Maurice Sloan, United States Marshal in and for the District of Columbia. Appeal from the District Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

728 Porto Rico Railway, Light and Power Company, vs. Adelberto Diaz Mon. On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals

argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the question certified must be answered in the negative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

415 Philadelphia & Reading Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, v. Margaret L. Hancock. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds

Philadelphia and Reading Railway Company, Petitioner,
415 vs
Margaret L. Hancock.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause, be and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Clarke.

Ohio Valley Water Company, Plaintiff in Error,
128 vs.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court with instructions to take further action not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Brandeis
Mr. Justice Holmes
Mr. Justice Clarke.

203

Leo Weidhorn
Petitioner,
vs.
Benjamin A. Levy
Trustee in Bankruptcy
of the Estate of

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court.

(Per Mr. Justice Pitney.)

The United States,
Appellant,
vs.
243 The Omaha Tribe of
Indians, and
The Omaha Tribe of

944 Appellant, vs. The United States. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims on appeal and cross appeal and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, as to the sum of $4,560.00 awarded for horses killed by the Sioux Indians, be, and the same is hereby, reversed and in other respects be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

654 Walter Evans, Plaintiff in Error, vs. J. Rogers Gore, Deputy and acting Collector of Internal Revenue for the Fifth Dis- In error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with cost; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Vandevanter.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Holmes.
Mr. Justice Brandeis.

566. The City of New York, Appellant, vs. The Consolidated Gas Company of New York et al. } Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Ap-

was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is adjudged and decreed now here ordered by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in this cause be and the same is hereby reversed at the cost of the appellant; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals with directions to dismiss the appeal.

Per Mr. Justice Clay.

582

George S. Hawke
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Harvey C. Smith,
Secretary of State
of Ohio.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the

paid Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Clark.

601. George S. Hawke, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Harvey C. Smith, Secretary of State of Ohio. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Clark.

E. A. Grow, N. M. Voight, W. M. Christianson and F. V. Woodworth, Plaintiffs in Error

Tuesday, June 1st 1920, continued.

Lynn J. Frazier, Governor, William Langer Attorney General, et al. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Dakota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Dakota and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

508

John N. Scott, William J. Howe, C.B. Severson et al, Appellants, vs. Lynn J. Frazier et al. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of North Dakota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of North Dakota and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed at the cost of the appellants; and that this cause be

Tuesday, June 1st 1920, continued

the said District Court with directions to dismiss the bill for want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr Justice Clay.

Fort Smith and Western Railroad Company and Superior Savings & Trust Company, Trustee, Appellants, vs. Arthur L. Mills, Receiver of the Fort Smith & Western Railroad Company and Virgil Bourland, U.S. Attorney. 42. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Arkansas and was argued by counsel

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this

remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Concurring Specially:
Mr. Justice White
Mr. Justice Van Devanter
Mr. Justice Pitney
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

291. The United States of America ex rel., Jennie Johnson, et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. John Barton Payne, Secretary of the Interior.

In error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia in this cause be

and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Fidelity Title and Trust Company, Ancillary Administrator of the Estate of Vernon M. Pancoast deceased, Petitioner, vs. The New Bois Electric Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

300

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs and interest until paid.

at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the Courts of the State of Pennsylvania; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

John M. Le Boeuf, Receiver of the Orinoco Company, Limited, Plaintiff in Error, vs. William G. McAdoo, Secretary of the Treasury.

In error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

304

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of a proper defendant in error to stand in judgment.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes

Tuesday, June 1st 1920, continued.

167 The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, v. Thomas C. MacMillan and Empire State Surety Company. In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Pitney
Mr. Justice Clarke.

Tuesday June 1st 1920, continued

570 John F. Monahue, Appellant, vs. Helen May Monahue alias Helen May Huskey. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Nevada.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Nevada and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

708. J. H. Purcell, J. D. Purcell Company and Security Trust Company, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The City of Lexington on relation of Thomas Elwyne Buck Tax Assessor. In error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

Tuesday, June 1st 1920, continued

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of Error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

John N. Hawdige,
Petitioner,
No.— vs.
Leo Simmons.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of error in this cause to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby granted upon giving bond in the sum of One Thousand dollars.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

705 Sarah Mary Wall, Administratrix of the Estate of Edward Wall, deceased, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company. On consideration of the motion for leave to omit certain parts of the transcript of the record in this cause in printing the same, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted without prejudice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

765 The Missouri Pacific Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. McGrew Coal Company. On consideration of the motion to vacate the supersedeas herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the plaintiff in error within twenty days from the date of this order, furnish an additional bond, in the sum of Twenty thousand dollars to be approved by the Clerk of this Court, and in default of compliance with this order, the supersedeas hitherto granted be vacated as prayed.

Tuesday, June 1st 1920, continued.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

American Steel Foundries, Petitioner. vs. The Tri-City Trades Council et al.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be restored to the docket for reargument.

John Barton Payne, Secretary of the Interior and Clay Tallman Commissioner of the General Land Office, Appellants, vs. The State of New Mexico; and The State of Wyoming, N. S. Ridgely and The Midwest Refining Company. Appellants, vs. The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion,

to advance these cases for a
ment after case No. 34 on
docket of the present time
It is now here ordered by
Court that the said motion
and the same is hereby gra
Per Mr. Chief Justice

909. The United States of America, Appellant, vs. Northern Pacific Railway Company.

On c
tion
mot
adv
this
for
me
case

on the docket for the present
It is now here ordered b
Court that the said motion
the same is hereby granted
Per Mr. Chief Justic

593 Charles E. Smith, Appellant, vs. Kansas City Title and Trust Company.

On con
tion of
motion
advan
cause
now h
ordere

the Court that said motion be,
same is hereby granted, and

cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 11th next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

627 The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Demitrios J. Theophilatos, Gregory Theophilatos, R. E. Spicer et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause it is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 11th next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

707 United Mine Workers of America et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Coronado Coal Company et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be

and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 11th next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

779 The United States, Petitioner, vs. National Surety Company; and

780 The United States, Petitioner, vs. National Surety Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the causes assigned for argument on Monday, October 11th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

791 The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. James Butt, alias Wong Sing

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 11th next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

William E. Johnson
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
845
The State of Maryland.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 11th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

John C. Steald, George E. Hamilton and Milton J. Lambert, Committee of the person and estate of Eugene Peters,
vs.
855
The District of Columbia.

Tuesday, June 1st 1920, continued

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 11th next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

906 The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. L. Cohen Grocery Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 11th next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

712 Western Union Telegraph Company, Petitioner, vs. Addie Speight

It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the Summary docket.

Tuesday, June 1st 1920, continued.

Henry S. DeRees,
Appellant,
931 vs.
Flavio Costaguta
Marcos A. Alguiré
Alejandro Sassoli and
Eugenio Ottolenghi
individually and co-
partners &c., et al.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be placed on the Summary docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Hannah P. Wilson,
Plaintiff in Error,
862 vs.
Curtis L. McDonnell.

On consideration of the motion to dismiss in this case,

It is now here ordered by the Court, that the said motion be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

El Paso & South-
western Railroad
Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
887 vs.
Robert L. Lovick.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to ~~dismiss~~ or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby postponed until the hear-

ing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

871 Henry Albers, Petitioner vs. The United States of America. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court That the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

900 Philadelphia and Reading Railway Company, Petitioner vs. Amy Smith. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition

for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner, vs. Beechnut Packing Company. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

9/6

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

889. The Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Charles S. Gaudet, Jr.,

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Mr. Chief Justice White took no part.

839 G. M. Bouldin, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.

Fifth Circuit.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as

against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

National Surety Company, Petitioner, vs. Lafayette County in the State of Mississippi, Fifth Circuit.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

863 Samuel L. Emerson, Petitioner v. The United States of America. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

872 A. M. Wheeler, Petitioner, v. Charles P. Salt and W. N. Greene. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the

argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

F. H. Orcutt & Son Company and David D. Miller and William A. Maurer, as Trustees &c.

Petitioners,

vs.

National Trust and Credit Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

880.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court, that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

885 The Chesapeake Steamship Company of Baltimore City, Owner, and John Thomas Master of the Steamer, "City of Norfolk" Petitioners, vs. Frank Staud, Master of the British Steamship "Hawkhead". On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

891 Anthony Phillips, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

Tuesday, June 1st 1920, continued

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

898 Hiram N. Stanai, John McNulty, Fritz John et al., Petitioners, vs. Frederick Leyland & Company, Limited, Claimant of the Steamship "Parisian" &c., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby

denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

907. Arnold Jacob Uhl, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

914. Curaco Maduig Company (Curacaosche Handel Maatschappij), Petitioner, vs. Carl Bjorge, Master and Claimant of the Steamship "Erathen" et al.

Tuesday, June 1st 1920, continued

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Order:

It is ordered that the cases heretofore placed on the Summary docket, viz Nos. 581, 712, and 931, be assigned for Monday, October 11th next, at the head of the call for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

22 Orig. The State of Georgia, Complainant, v. The State of South Carolina.

The motion for an order of reference herein, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr.

Tuesday, June 1st 1920, continued

in behalf of counsel for the defendant.

14 The United States, Appellant, vs. The Quaker Oats Company et al. } Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Ames, of counsel for the appellant, and he having moved to dismiss this appeal,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

833 Western Union Telegraph Company, Petitioner, vs. S. B. Foster. } The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. C. B. Ames in behalf of counsel for the plaintiff in Error.

Tuesday, June 1st 1920, continued

Harry B. Pedrow, as U.S. Attorney for the District of Colorado, Appellant,
952 vs.
The A. D. Lewis & Son Dry Goods Company et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr Assistant to the Attorney General Ames for the Appellant

R. E. Kennington et al., Appellants,
968 vs.
A. Mitchell Palmer et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Ames

for the appellant.

American Column & Lumber Company et al Appellants,
976 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr Assistant to the Attorney General Ames

for the appellees.

The United States, Appellant,
vs.

Monday June 1st 1920, continued:

L. P. and J. A. Smith. The motion to remand this cause for additional findings was submitted by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Ames for the appellant.

Morris Zucker
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
411 The United States of America.

The motion to Vacate Stay order submitted by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Ames for the plaintiff in error.

N. Snowden Marshall, as Receiver &c.,
Petitioner,
vs.
886. The People of the State of New York.

The motion to place this cause on the Summary docket was submitted by Mr. C. B. Ames in behalf of counsel for the petitioner.

Vogt Brothers Manufacturing Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
—Orig'l Elliott Machine Corporation.

Tuesday, June 1st 1920, continued

The petition for a writ of error herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alex. G. Bartlett and Mr. Helm Bruce for the petitioner.

Angel Vargas,
Petitioner,
vs.
882 F. M. Yaptico & Company.

The petition for writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Ernest Wilkinson for the petitioner.

Ex parte In the Matter of the Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company,

The motion for leave to file petition for writs of Prohibition or mandamus herein was submitted by Mr. Lawrence Maxwell Mr. William L. Clay and Mr. J. S. Graydon for the petitioner.

Southern Pacific Railroad Company,
Appellant,
vs.
938 Franklin K. Lane, Secretary &c., et al.

Substitution of John Barton Payne, present Secretary of the Interior in the place of Franklin K. Lane former Secretary

as Party appellee ordered
of Mr. A. D. Stoehlig in the

Charles D. Newton,
Attorney General, &c.,
et al.,
Appellants;
886 vs.
Brooklyn Union
Gas Company.

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
27 Orig'l vs
The State of Texas.

Modify order appointing rec
submitted by Mr. Reese he
support of the motion. Exc
Response of Micajah - Mr.
filed, on motion of Mr. R
Also in support of the

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
27 Orig'l vs.
The State of Texas.

Magnolia Petroleum Associo
Association and ninety-
submitted by Mr. Stacy S

tinued.)

on motion
at behalf

e motion to
dvance this
ause was
ubmitted
y Mr. Ely
Seomans
r the appellants.

The motion
of Micajah
M. Brooks,
ndividually
as Trustee to
eiver, was
also in
eptions of
Brooks &c,
Reese &
ause.

he motion
petition for
ave to
intervene
the Humble
mpany
hree others
Barger,

Tuesday, June 1st 1920, continued.

in behalf of Messrs James A. Pilkington and Edwin A. Cassels for the petitioners.

Silver King Coalition Mines Company, Petitioner, vs. Conklin Mining Company.

489.

The motion to vacate order allowing writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. E. B. Critchlow, Mr. H. H. McClusky, Mr. W. W. Ray and Mr. William H. King for the respondent in support of the motion and by Mr. H. Hickson, Mr. A. C. Ellis Jr., Mr. Curtis H. Lindley, Mr. S. R. Lucas and Mr. Thomas Maroneaux for the petitioner in opposition thereto, and by Mr. Solicitor General King for the United States with leave to the moving party to file additional papers.

The United States of America, Appellant, vs. Reading Company et al. and Reading Company et al.

3.

4 Appellants,
vs.
The United States
of America

for Reading Company

The motion to modify decree submitted by Mr. William Clarke Mason, et al.

The United States
of America
Appellant,
3 vs.
Reading Company
et al.;
and
Reading Company
et al.,
Appellants,
4 vs.
The United States
of America.

The motion to modify decree was submitted by Mr. Charles E. Miller and Mr. Robert H. McForest for Central Railroad Company of New Jersey, and The Lehigh and Wilkes-Barre Coal Company.

Union Pacific Rail-
road Company et al.,
(Plaintiffs in Error)

Tuesday June 1st 1920, continued.

vs.
M. K. Jenkins et al.

The motion to set aside order of dismissal herein was submitted to the considera-tion of the Court by Mr. William E. Lynn for the Plaintiffs in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. J. G. Butler for the defendants in error in opposition thereto.

American Column Lumber Company, et al,
Appellants,
vs.
The United States of America

The motion for a stay herein was submitted by Mr. G. Carroll Todd for the appellant in support of the motion, with leave to Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General to file response within three days.

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
vs.
The State of Texas.

Leave granted to file response to Exceptions and object-ion of The United States, on motion of Mr. Ast. Carriguer in that behalf.

Tuesday, June 1st 1920, continued.

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
vs.
27 Orig. The State of Texas.

Leave granted to file exceptions and response of Millis Consolidated Placer Royal Mining Company to receiver's report herein, on motion of Mr. J. S. Howard in that behalf.

Mary L. Greer Conklin
Appellant,
vs.
946 The Augusta Chronicle
Publishing Company.

The motion to advance was submitted by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler for the appellant.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler for the appellant.

John White,
Petitioner,
vs.
940 The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. W. C. Herron for the respondent.

Tuesday, June 1st 1920, continued

The State of Arkansas, Complainant, vs. The State of Mississippi. 7 Orig'l

The motion to suspend further proceedings submitted by Mr. Murdock Styles in behalf of Mr. Frank Robertson, Mr. Gerald Fitz Gerald, Mr. George H. Maynard, Mr. Marcellus Green and Mr. Garner W. Green for the defendant in support of the motion, and by Mr. John M. Arbuckle and Mr. Herbert Pope for the complainant in opposition thereto. Leave granted to file opposition to motion &c., on motion of Mr. K. McLoor in behalf of counsel for the complainant.

Pete Morgan, Petitioner, vs. The State of Louisiana. 971

The Petition for writ of Certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. R. E. Milling for the Petitioner.

Lincoln Gas & Electric Light Company, vs. City of Lincoln et al. 810

The motion to dismiss herein was submitted by Mr. C. Petrus Peterson for the appellees.

in support of the motion and by Mr. Charles A Rueauff and Mr. Robert Burns for the Appellant in opposition thereto.

854 R. L. Mayfield
Petitioner,
vs.
The State of Tennessee ex rel A. M. Gerard

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by James A Cobb for the Petitioner.

874 Fred B Sullivan
Petitioner,
vs.
P. Sanford Ross, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Henry J. Bigham for the Petitioner and by Mr. Asa Everett for the respondent.

884 Harmon P. McKnight,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Harmon P. McKnight for the Petitioner, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely

for the respondent.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. R. L. Block. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Troy Pace for the Petitioner.

893.

George M. Canfield et al., Petitioners, vs. Susanna Brink. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. John Devereux, Mr. Bird McGuire, Mr. Charles H. Grimes and Mr. William J. Hughes for the Petitioners and by Mr. R. A. McDougal and Mr. H. V. Pryor for the respondent.

894.

George M. Canfield, et al., Petitioners, vs. Ira E. Cornelius et al. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. John Devereux, Mr. Bird McGuire, Mr. William

895

Tuesday June 1st 1920, continued

and Mr. Charles A. Grimes for the petitioners and by Mr. Joseph C. Stone, Mr. George S. Ransey, Mr. M. L. Rosser, Mr. Charles A. Mobd and Mr. Francis Stewart for the respondent.

902 C. B. Schoberg, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Sherman T. McPherson for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. W. C. Herron for the respondent.

902 Henry Kruse, Petitioner vs. The United States of America. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sherman T. McPherson for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. W. C. Herron for the respondent.

Henry Fellman,
Petitioner,
vs.
904 The United States
of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr Sherman P. McPherson for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Peter Nimmer,
Petitioner,
vs.
905. The United States
of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Frederick M. Schmidt for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Fidelity and Casualty
Company of New York,
Petitioner,
vs.
908. Wallace L. Schaub,
Trustee, &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. J. Wilmer Latimer for the petitioner and by Mr. Newton D. Baker, for the respondent.

912 and 913. Joseph Bivins Sr. Petitioner, vs. United Timber Corporation. The petition for writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Hugh St. O'Bear, Mr. Julian Mitchell and Mr. Charles A. Douglas for the petitioner and by Mr. Legare Walker for the respondent.

919. Orville Anderson, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joe Kirby for the petitioner and by the Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

925. May Ammerman, Petitioner vs. The United States of America. The petition for writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Robert D. Morrison for the petitioner & by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart for

726. Eugene Sol Louie, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — The Petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr R E McKelland for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. W. C. Herron for the respondent.

728. Commercial Credit Company, Petitioner, vs. Sponge Exchange Bank of Pascagoula Sponge — The Petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. M. B. McFarland Mr. [illegible] Pettingill and Mr. Leo O'Donovan for the petitioner and by Mr. James L. Glen for the respondent.

732. John Simmons Company, Petitioner, vs. The Gulf Brothers Company. — The Petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. James L. Rice for the petitioner and by Mr. Glenn [illegible] for the respondent.

Tuesday, June 1st 1920, continued

Mr. George H. Parmalee and Mr. George E. Stebbins for the respondent.

942 Aetna Life Insurance Company, Petitioner, vs. Walter W. Braud. The petition for writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. William N. Foster for the petitioner and by Mr. Louis L. Waters for the respondent.

945. N. B. Treadwell Petitioner; vs. The United States of America. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Harry K. Wolcott for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and and Mr. W. C. Herron for the respondent.

947. George E. Vandenberg, Petitioner, vs. Electric Welding Company. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Carlos P. Griffin

Tuesday, June 1st 1920, continued.

for the petitioner and by Mr. Frederick W. Hinter for the respondent.

949 Sandad Master & Claimant &c., et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America et al. Respondents.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Henry L. Little for the petitioner and by Mr. Frederick W. Hinter for the respondent.

957 Peck, Stowe & Wilcox Company, Petitioner, vs. The A. O. Smith Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Frederick P. Fish for the petitioner and by Mr. Archibald Cox for the respondent.

959 Thomas Pennacchio, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari was submitted by Mr. John B. Golden for the petitioner.

Tuesday, June 1st 1920 continued

St Paul Fire and Marine Insurance Company, Petitioner,
vs.
960 Hegemeyer Trading Company, and
St. Paul Fire and Marine Insurance Company, Petitioner,
vs.
961 Hugo A. Thomsen et al.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Roger Englar and Mr. Oscar R Houston for the petitioner and by Mr. Van Vechten Veeder for the respondents.

Roxford Knitting Company, Petitioner,
vs.
965 Moore and Tierney, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Walter S. Hobbs

Tuesday, June 1st continued:

and Mr. David J. Gallert for the Petitioner and by Mr. Thomas O'Connor for the respondent.

766 Rockford Knitting Company, Petitioner, vs. Williams Moore Knitting Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Walter S. Hilborn and Mr. David J. Gallert for the Petitioner and by Mr. Thomas O'Connor for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Friday next at twelve o'clock, unless sooner called.

#

Friday June 4th 1920 ——

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wm A Coombs it is ordered that Flora Paltkin of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William A Ayres it is ordered that Edwin C. Wilco Esquire, of Anthony, State of Kansas

Friday, June 4th 1920, continued.

be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Townsend it is ordered that Earl J. Davis, Esquire, of Saginaw, State of Michigan be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter S. Penfield it is ordered that Farnham P. Griffiths, Esquire of San Francisco, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. P. M. Loughran it is ordered that Harris E. Perkins, Esquire of Visalia, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas F. Blanton it is ordered that Gibb Galloway Esquire, of Comanche, State of Texas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. A. Postelle it is ordered that Lucas P. Underwood Esquire of Washington District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney it is ordered that George Randolph Lubin Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
Orig'l
vs.
The State of Texas.

Friday, June 4th 1920, continued.

The Supplemental report of the Receiver was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John S Spalding Plannery for the Receiver.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at twelve o'clock.

Monday June 7th 1920 ——

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C McReynolds
Louis D Brandeis
John H Clarke
Associate Justices

Frank H Jones Esquire Marshal,
James D Maher, Clerk,

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L M Smith it is ordered that Frank M White, Esquire of St Louis, State of Missouri and Walter M Kimball, Esquire of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A Garland Hughes

it is ordered that Charles D. M
Esquire of New Orleans, State
Louisiana be admitted to prac
as an attorney and counsello
this Court, and he was sworn
ordingly.

On motion first made to th
in this behalf by Mr. John Boy
Carmody it is ordered that Au
Rendigs, Jr. Esquire, of Cincinna
State of Ohio, and George K. Bra
Esquire, of Kansas City, State o
Missouri, be admitted to practic
attorneys and counsellors of thi
and they were sworn accordingly

On motion first made to th
in this behalf by Mr. Frank P
it is ordered that James M. S
Esquire, of Washington, Distri
of Columbia be admitted to p
as an attorney and counsellor a
Court and he was sworn ac

On motion first made to th
in this behalf by Mr. John E.
it is ordered that Edward P. C
quire, of Santa Rosa State of
fornia be admitted to practic
an attorney and counsellor a

Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jerry C. South, it is ordered that Whitehall M. Moss Esquire of Providence State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Levi Cooke, it is ordered that A. Blagnall, Esquire, of Anderson, State of South Carolina be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sidney A. Paliafero it is ordered that Frederic H. Bowdeu Esquire of New York City and Benjamin William Lipman Esquire of Los Angeles, State of California be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Monday June 7th 1920 continue

On motion first made to the
in this behalf by Mr. J. Arthur
Johnson it is ordered that Sa
W. Root Esquire of Philadelphia
Joseph Knox Pomance Esquire o
Norristown State of Penney lvan
be admitted to practice as Attor
and counsellors of this Court and
they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the
in this behalf by Mr. Harry S. M
it is ordered that James Cox o
Portland, State of Maine, be ad
to practice as an attorney and
counsellor of this Court and
was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the
Court in this behalf by Mr. C
L. Jones it is ordered that C
J. Smith, Esquire, of Spring Cit
of Pennsylvania, be admitted t
practice as an attorney and c
of this Court and he was swo
accordingly.

On motion first made to the
Court in this behalf by Mr. E
Jackson it is ordered that
Robb Esquire of Washington,

trict of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court by Mr. James M. Hatten it is ordered that Elisha Powell Norman, Esquire of Rayville, State of Louisiana be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paca Oberlin it is ordered that James Wilson Bailey, Esquire of Cold Spring, State of New York be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis Addison Hunt, it is ordered that Beverly Mercer Hartman, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Monday, June 7th 1920, cont

On motion first made to
Court in this behalf by Mr. P
V. Keyser it is ordered that
J. Wheeler, Esquire, of Washing
District of Columbia be admi
to practice) as an attorney a
counsellor of this Court and
was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to
Court in this behalf by Mr L
Cooke, it is ordered that Ira
Murphy, Esquire, of San Fra
State of California, be admitte
practice as an attorney and
of this Court and he was swo
accordingly.

On motion first made to
in this behalf by Mr. Frederic
Kenney it is ordered that A
Mr. Shumaker, Esquire, of C
State of Ohio, be admitted to
tice) as an attorney and coun
of this Court and he was swo
accordingly.

On motion first made to
Court in this behalf by Mr
R. Stallings it is ordered th
Brindley, Esquire of Gadsde

State of Alabama be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn, accordingly.

George E. Beidler, Appellant, vs. The United States — Appeal from the Court of Claims.

260

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court That the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke

Kwock Jan Fat, Petitioner, vs. Edward White Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of San Francisco. — Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

313

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from

Monday, June 7th 1920, continued

the United States Circuit Court of
Appeals for the Ninth Circuit a
was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It
now here ordered adjudged and de
creed by this Court that the decre
of the said United States Circu
Court of Appeals in this cause, b
and the same is hereby reversed
costs; and that this cause be, and
same is hereby remanded to the Di
Court of the United States for the
Northern District of California w
directions to issue the writ of h
corpus and for a trial of the
per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Federal Trade
Commission,
Petitioner,
vs.
Anderson Gratz and
Benjamin Gratz, co-
partners doing busi-
ness under the firm
name and style of
Warren, Jones & Gratz
et al.

No. 492

On wri
certiora
to the
States
cuit C
of Ap
for th
Secon
Circ

This cause came on to be he
on the transcript of the record

the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof; It is now here ordered adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; ~~and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court with directions~~.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Brandeis
Mr. Justice Clarke.
(Mr. Justice Pitney concurs in the result).

Joseph E. Nadeau, Martha Nadeau, his wife, et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
119. Union Pacific Railroad Company.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the Transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas and was argued by counsel.

Monday, June 7th 1920, continued

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs;

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Clarke.
(Mr. Justice Holmes, Mr. Justice Pitney and Mr. Justice Brandeis took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

165.

T. S. Royster Guano Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Commonwealth of Virginia.

In error to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby

reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court of Appeals for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Brandeis
Mr. Justice Holmes.

The State of Rhode Island,
Complainant,
vs.
A. Mitchell Palmer,
Attorney General, and
Daniel C. Roper, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

In Equity.

This cause came on to be heard on the bill of complaint and the motion of counsel for the defendants to dismiss the bill, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the bill of complaint in this cause be, and

Monday, June 7th, 1920, continued.

the same is hereby dismissed with costs.
Per Mr. Justice Vanderventer.

The State of New Jersey,
Complainant,
vs.
30 Orig'l. A. Mitchell Palmer,
Attorney General and
Daniel C. Roper, Commissioner of Internal
Revenue.

In Equity.

This cause came on to be heard on the bill of complaint and the motion of counsel for the defendant to dismiss the bill, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the bill of complaint in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.
Per Mr. Justice Vanderventer.

George C. Kempsey,
Appellant,
vs.
696 Thomas J. Boynton,
United States Attorney
for Massachusetts, and
Andrew J. Casey, Act-
ing Collector of Internal

Monday, June 7th 1920, continued

Revenue for Massachusetts.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna

Kentucky Distilleries & Warehouse Company,
Appellant,
752. vs.
W. V. Gregory, District Attorney for the United States for the Western District of Kentucky, and Elwood Hamilton, Collector of Internal Revenue

Monday, June 7th, 1920, continued.

for the Collection District of Kentucky.

Appeal from the District Court of the Western District of Kentucky.

United States for the Western District of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice McKenna.

Christian Deigen Sons, Appellant,

vs.

788. Joseph L. Bodine, United States Attorney for the District of New Jersey and Charles [illegible] Collector

nday, June 7th 1920, continued.

Internal Revenue
the the Fifth District
New Jersey.

Appeal from
the District
Court of the
United States

the District of New Jersey.

This cause came on to be heard on
transcript of the record from the
District Court of the United States for
District of New Jersey, and was
gued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is
ow here ordered, adjudged and
cred by this Court that the decree
the said District Court of the
nited States in this cause be, and
e same is hereby, affirmed with
sts.

Mr. Justice Vanlevanter.

dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna.

Hiram A. Sawyer,
s United States
ttorney for the East-
ern District of Wis-
consin, et al.,
Appellants,
vs.
Manitowoc Products
Company.

Appeal from
the District
Court of the
United States
for the Eastern
District of
Wisconsin

Monday, June 7th, 1920, continued

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court with directions to dismiss the bill of complaint.

Per Mr. Justice Vanderva

Dissenting: Mr. Justice McKenna.

837

St. Louis Brewing Association, Appellant,

vs.

George A. Moore, Collector of Internal Revenue, &c., et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District

Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna.

Lincoln Gas and Electric Light Company, Appellant,
vs.
The City of Lincoln et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Monday, June 7th 1920, continued

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

No. 27, Original.—October Term, 1919.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
vs.
The State of Texas, Defendant; The United States of America, Intervener.

ORDER INSTRUCTING RECEIVER.

Upon consideration of the First Report of Frederic A. Delano, Receiver, in the above-entitled cause and of the supplemental report of June 3, 1920, and the various suggestions of the United States, intervener, and of the State of Texas, and of the several motions, applications, exceptions, and suggestions heretofore filed by parties claiming an interest in the subject-matter of this suit, it is this seventh day of June, A. D. 1920, adjudged and ordered that the action of said Receiver in taking possession of and operating under his own management and control the property described in the order of this court of April 1, 1920, until the further order of this court, including the oil and gas wells and plants, toll bridges, water plants, tank wagons, pipe lines, storage tanks, and other property located thereon and therein; the arrangements made by said Receiver for guarding and policing said property; the office and field organization created by him for the operation and development of the property and the resources thereof, and for collecting, conserving, and investing the proceeds of the sale of all oil, gas, gasoline, and other products taken therefrom since April 1, 1920, be, and they are hereby, ratified and approved.

2. So much of the land described in the order of this court of April 1, 1920, in Range 14 west, as lies between the south edge of the present sand-bed of the Red River (marked generally by the border line of vegetation along the edge of the flood plain) and the foot of the Texas bluff, as was on the 1st day of April, 1920, in the possession of persons claiming under patents from the State of Texas, and is not included in the river-bed lands, as hereinafter

Monday, June 7th 1920, continued.

defined, shall be returned by the Receiver to the several operators or claimants in possession on April 1, 1920, or their assigns, together with all wells, tanks, pipe lines, structures, equipment, and material, upon condition that such operator, claimant, or assigns account for, pay over to, and impound with the Receiver, if not already done, three-sixteenths of the gross proceeds of all oil taken from the respective lands on and since April 1, 1920, and the royalty on commercial gas customary in the Burk-Burnett and Northwest Extension oil fields, and royalty on casing-head gas in accordance with the regulations and schedule of prices promulgated for Indian lands by the Secretary of the Interior August 10, 1917, the proceeds thereof to be either paid in cash, or the payment thereof within ninety days to be secured by good and sufficient surety to be approved by the Receiver, and upon the further condition that said operator or claimant shall enter into an agreement in writing with the Receiver, by the terms of which the operator shall develop and operate said properties in a workmanlike and businesslike manner, subject to the supervision of the Receiver and to the orders of this court, and shall impound with the Receiver three-sixteenths of the gross amount of the proceeds from the sale of oil thereafter produced, and the royalty on gas and casing-head gas as hereinbefore specified. This agreement to contain such further stipulations as the Receiver may deem proper for regulating the production of gas and oil and to prevent waste or the entrance of water to the oil sands or oil bearing strata to the destruction or injury of the oil deposits or the damage of wells in the possession of the Receiver; and, provided further, that the Receiver, in his discretion, may agree with any operator or claimant to operate for his benefit and at his expense the lands in said "Big Bend" area. Until the several operators or claimants comply with the foregoing conditions, the Receiver shall retain possession of the respective properties and shall operate the same in accordance with the order of this court of April 1, 1920, as modified by this order.

In the event of failure or refusal of any operator to operate the property as directed by the Receiver, or if any operator shall violate his agreement with the Receiver, the Receiver is authorized to take possession of and operate such property, impound three-sixteenths of the proceeds as provided by this order, and pay out of said proceeds the expenses of operation, keeping a separate account of the expense of production of each well as nearly as practicable.

1184

Monday, June 7th 1920, continued.

3. The river-bed lands, for the purposes of this order, shall comprise all lands not hereinbefore excepted, being more specifically that part covered by the receivership of all the broad and approximately flat sandy stretch which extends from the foot of the bluff or the edge of the flood plain, as the case may be, on the south side of the river, to the midchannel of the river as defined in said order of April 1, 1920, and as it then existed including everything within the bounds just described.

4. It is further ordered that said Receiver be and he is hereby authorized and directed, out of the gross proceeds derived from the production of any well in the river-bed area paid to him since April 1, 1920, (1) to pay to the operator or operators of any such well the actual cost of operating the same since April 1, 1920, inclusive, including in such cost a reasonable allowance for field supervision, but excluding any allowance for general or office supervision; (2) to refund to those operators or drillers who have drilled and brought into production new wells in said area since April 1, 1920, a fair percentage of the entire actual cost of such work, including a reasonable allowance for field supervision, but excluding any allowance for general or office supervision; (3) to pay the just claims of mechanics and materialmen for work done and materials furnished on wells in said area brought in since April 1, 1920, and the claims of persons, associations, and corporations for advancements made in good faith for drilling operations upon such wells, provided satisfactory evidence of the existence of all of such claims be furnished.

5. Said Receiver is further authorized and directed to release and surrender to the lawful owners thereof (1) all oil and gas stored within the receivership area which is shown by evidence satisfactory to him to have been produced by operations outside of said area; (2) all machinery, tools and other equipment stored within the receivership area when the Receiver took possession and not actually used in the production, storage, transportation, etc., of the oil and gas products thereof, and such other machinery, tools, drilling rigs and similar apparatus found within the receivership area as may not be required for the receivership operations; (3) all oil, gas and the products thereof which are shown by evidence satisfactory to the Receiver to have been produced by operations outside of the receivership area, but which were mingled and stored with similar products produced within said area on and subsequent to April 1, 1920.

Monday, June 7th 1920, continued

6. Said Receiver is further authorized and directed (1) to arrange for the sale and disposition of all oil, gas, gasoline, water, and other products of said property; (2) to take possession and license the operation of all toll bridges within the receivership area, and to regulate and limit the tolls chargeable thereon; (3) to sell at the best price obtainable, properly credit and account for, such derricks, tanks, pipe lines, tools, appliances and materials not claimed by the owners thereof and not required for the Receiver's operations; (4) to purchase at the best price obtainable such tanks, machinery, appliances, tools, motor cars, and equipment, as may be necessary for the operation, protection, and development of the property in his charge; (5) to retain and employ whatever technical or other assistants he may require or may deem necessary to satisfactorily operate, develop and protect the property in his charge, fix the terms of employment and the rate of compensation; (6) to make such banking arrangements as he may deem necessary to properly conserve and safeguard the funds resulting from his operations and to invest the surplus funds in United States Treasury certificates; (7) to make such contracts for fire, tornado, employee and public liability insurance as may be deemed necessary or advisable and take whatever other reasonable precautions are customarily employed in the management, operation, development, and protection of oil and gas properties of similar magnitude.

7. The Receiver is hereby further authorized and directed to drill in the river-bed area described in paragraph 3 hereof, and bring into production whatever new wells he may be advised by his geologist and other experts are necessary for the conservation and development of the river-bed lands as a whole, pay the cost thereof out of the funds in his hands derived from the production of the wells in said river-bed area, keep separate accounts of the costs of drilling and operating and of the proceeds of the production of each well, and make a full report thereof, with his recommendations for the equitable allocation and distribution of such costs and proceeds, as soon after the court reconvenes in October next as may be practicable.

8. In addition to the specific powers herein contained, the Receiver, until the further order of this court, is hereby given whatever additional administrative powers may be found to be necessary to properly protect, operate, manage and develop the property within the receivership area and the oil and gas deposits therein.

Monday June 7th 1920 continued

9. The receiver is directed to report to the court, for such action as it may deem necessary and proper any interference with the property or operations in his charge and any violation of the orders and directions given by him in the performance of his official duties; and he may apply in vacation to the Chief Justice or any Associate Justice of this court for a writ of injunction in any case where an injunction might be granted by the court.

10. Nothing in the order of this court of April 1, 1920, or in this order shall be construed to prevent or in anywise obstruct the duly constituted authorities of the United States and of the States of Texas and Oklahoma in the exercise of their several and respective jurisdictions, as heretofore, in the prevention, detention and punishment of crime within the area embraced within the orders of this court.

The parties thereto and their respective officers and agents are requested to afford to the Receiver and his agents all reasonable and appropriate assistance in guarding, protecting and conserving the property within said area.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte In the Matter of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of prohibition or a writ of mandamus herein, it is nowhere ordered by and the Court that the said motion be, the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte In the Matter of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner

On consideration of the petition for a writ of prohibition or a writ of mandamus herein

It is now here ordered by the Court that cause be shown by the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio, Western Division, before this Court at the City of Washington, on Monday, October 4th 1920, or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard, why the prayer of said petition should not be granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, June 7th 1920, continued.

The State of Arkansas, Complainant
vs.
7 Orig'l — The State of Mississippi.

On consideration of the motion to Stay further proceedings in this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The State of Georgia, Complainant,
vs.
22 Orig'l — The State of South Carolina.

On consideration of the motion for the appointment of a Special Master to take such testimony as may be necessary and to receive in evidence such exhibits as may be offered by the parties hereto,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and, on the suggestion of counsel for both parties, Mr. Charles S. Douglas, of Washington, D.C., is appointed as such Special Master and directed to report the testimony and exhibits to the Court without conclusions of law or findings of fact, on or before Monday, October 4th, 1920.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States of America, Appellant, vs. Reading Company et al., and Reading Company et al., Appellants, vs. The United States of America. 8 4

On consideration of the motions to modify the decree in these cases, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Morris Zucker, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America. 411

On consideration of the motion to vacate the stay order in this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Union Pacific Railroad Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error,

298 W. K. Jenkins et al. vs. On consideration of the motion to the judgment of dismissal and reinstate this cause to the docket,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per M. Chief Justice White

970 American Column & Lumber Company, et al., Appellants, vs. The United States of America. On consideration of the motion for order staying or suspending during the pendency of this appeal of a part of the final decree of the District Court herein,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per M. Chief Justice White

734 The United States, Appellant, vs. L. P. & J. A. Smith On consideration of the motion to remand this cause to the District Court of the

for additional findings.

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Silver King Coalition Mines Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
489 Conkling Mining Company.

On consideration of the motion to vacate the order allowing a writ of certiorari in this case. It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

W. Snowden Marshall as Receiver of All Package Grocery Store Company,
Petitioner
vs.
831 The People of the State of New York and
Mary L. Greer Conklin,
Appellant,
vs.
946 The Augusta Chronicle Publishing Company.

Monday, June 7th 1920, continue

It is ordered by the Court
these cases be placed on the
docket and assigned for arg
at the head of the call for Mo
October 11th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice

Daniel O'Connell
et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
221. vs.
The United States
of America.

It is
by the
that
mand
this ca
stayed
thirty

Per Mr. Chief Justice

Charles D. Newton,
Attorney General of
the State of New York
et al.,
Appellants,
886 vs.
Brooklyn Union Gas
Company.

On c
tion
moti
advi
caus
now
ord
the
that

said motion be, and the same
hereby, granted, and the cause
for argument, on Monday, Oct
11th next, after the cases here
assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice

Western Union Telegraph Company, Petitioner,
833. vs.
S. B. Poston.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 11th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Harry B. Pedrow as United States Attorney for the District of Colorado, Appellant,
952. vs.
The A. D. Lewis & Son Dry Goods Company et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 11th next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

968 R. E. Kennington et al., Appellants, vs. A. Mitchell Palmer, Attorney General et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 11th next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

970 American Column & Lumber Company, Appellant, vs. The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted and the cause assigned for argument on monday, October 11th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Eugene Sol Louie, Petitioner

976 vs.

The United States of America, } On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court, that the said petition be and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

John Simmons Company, Petitioner } On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

932 vs.

The Grier Brothers Company.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this

Monday, June 7th 1920, continued

that the said petition be and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice

730

Boston West Africa Trading Company, Petitioner,
vs.
Quaker City Morocco Company.
First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit and of the arguments of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now ordered by this Court, that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice

854.

R. L. Mayfield, Petitioner,
vs.
The State of Tennessee ex rel F. M. Gerard.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee.

Per

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Fred B. Sullivan,
Petitioner,
vs.
P. Sanford Ross, Inc.

87 On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

#18

Monday June 7th 1926 continued.

Angel Vargas,
Petitioner,
vs.
842. A.M. Yaptico &
Company.

On petition
writ of certio
to the Supre
Court of the
Philippine I

On consideration of the petitio
for a writ of certiorari herein to th
Supreme Court of the Philippine
lands and of the argument of coun
thereupon had, as well in suppor
as against the same it is now h
ordered by this Court that the said
petition be, and the same is here
denied.

By the Court. Chief Justice Taft

Harmon P. Mac-
Knight,
Petitioner,
vs.
884 The United States
of America.

On petition
writ of cer
to the Unit
States Cir
Court of
Peals fo
First Circ

On consideration of the petit
for a writ of certiorari herein t
United States Circuit Court of
Peals for the First Circuit and
the argument of counsel thereup
had, as well in support of ad

ordered by this Court, that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner,
893. vs.
R. L. Block.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

George M. Caufield et al., Petitioners,
894 vs.
Susanna Brink.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition

for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of, as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

George N. Caufield, et al., Petitioners, vs. Ira E. Cornelius et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma

895.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

902. C. B. Schoberg, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States for the Sixth Circuit and of the argument of counsel Thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

903 Henry Kruse, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and of the argument of counsel there-

upon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Henry Pettman,
Petitioner,
vs.
904. The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court, that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Peter Skinner,
Petitioner,
vs.
905 The United States

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Mr. Chief Justice White.

Fidelity & Casualty Company of New York, Petitioner,
vs.
Wallace L. Schaubs, Trustee in Bankruptcy for the Estate of Hudson & Fowler,

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and

of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Joseph Bivins, Sr.,
Petitioner,
vs.
United Fuel Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

912 913

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit for the Fourth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Orville Anderson,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of

919

Monday, June 7th 1920, continued

Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court, that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

925 Day Ammerman, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

928

Commercial Credit Company, Petitioner,
vs.
Sponge Exchange Bank of Tarpon Springs.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

940

John White, Petitioner,
vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that

the said Petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Aetna Life Insurance Company, Petitioner,
vs.
Walter W. Braud.

943 On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had adadwell in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

H. B. Tredwell, Petitioner,
vs.
The United States of America.

945 On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the Petition

the United States Circuit Court of
Appeals for the Fourth Circuit a
of the argument of counsel thereupo
had, as well in support of as
against the same, it is now here
ordered by this Court that the sam
petition be, and the same is hereby
denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice W

946 Mary L. Grun Conklin,
Appellant,
vs.
The Augusta Chronicle
Publishing
Company.

On consid
tion of the
petition f
writ of c
ossari her
It is now
here ordered by the Court that the sa
petition be, and the same is hereby,
denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice W

947. George E. Vandeudwagh,
Petitioner,
vs.
Electric Welding Com-
pany.

On petition
for writ o
certiorari
The United
States Ci
Court of A

Seals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition fo
writ of certiorari herein to the United

States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

949 E. Saudad, Master and Claimant &c., et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Peck, Stow & Wilcox Company, Petitioners,

957 vs. The N. O. Smith & Company. On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

959 Thomas Pennacchio, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by

this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

960 St Paul Fire and Marine Insurance Company, Petitioner, vs. Stageman and Braden Company. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

961 St Paul Fire & Marine Insurance Company, Petitioner, vs. Hugo A. Thomsen et al. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court

of Appeals for the Second Circuit

Monday, June 7th, 1920, contin

On consideration of the
for a writ of certiorari herein
United States Circuit Court of
Seals for the Second Circuit a
argument of counsel thereupon
as well in support of as aga
same it is now here ordered
Court that the said Petition be,
the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Wh

965. Roxford Knitting Company, Petitioner, vs. Moore & Kerney, (Inc.).

On
for
certi
to the
Stat
cuit
of Appeals for the Second Cir
On consideration of the
for a writ of certiorari herein
United States Circuit Court of
Seals for the Second Circuit a
the argument of counsel thereu
had as well in support of a
the same, it is now here ordere
this Court that the said Pet
be, and the same is hereby

Per Mr. Chief Justice Wh

Roxford Knitting Company, Petitioner,
966 vs.
William Moore Knitting Company.

On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Chief Justice White

Pete Morgan, Petitioner,
971 vs.
The State of Louisiana

On Petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of

ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

27 Orig. The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, vs. The State of Texas. — The motion to set case down for hearing on certain points was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General King for the United States; with leave to the State of Texas to suggest additional questions on motion of Mr. N. A. Kellogg in that behalf.

320 The North American Transportation & Trading Company, Appellant, vs. The United States. — Leave granted to present petition for a rehearing within sixty days on motion of Mr. Burt E. Barlow, for the appellant.

696 George L. Dempsey, Appellant, vs. Thomas J. Boynton, U.S. Attorney &c., et al. — Leave granted to present a petition for rehearing within sixty days on motion of Mr. Levi Cooke for the appellant.

Monday, June 7th 1920, continued:

788 Christian Feigenspan, Appellant, vs. Joseph L. Bodine, U.S. Attorney &c., et al., and Hiram Sawyer, as U.S. Attorney &c., et al., Appellants, vs. 794 Manitowoc Products Company, Appellee in No. 794.

Leave granted to present a petition for rehearing within 60 days on motion of Mr. Robert Cranin for the appellant in No. 788, and for the

The State of Rhode Island, Complainant, vs. 29 Orig'l A. Mitchell Palmer et al.;

The State of New Jersey, Complainant, vs. 30 Orig'l A. Mitchell Palmer, Attorney General et al.;

Kentucky Distilleries

752	A. Warehouse Company, Appellant, vs. N. V. Gregory, District Attorney for the U.S. &c., et al.; and St. Louis Brewing Association Appellant, vs. George A. Moore Collector of Internal Revenue, et al.	Leave granted to present petitions for rehearing herein, within sixty days, on motion of Mr. Levi Cooke in that behalf.
294	C. C. Calhoun, Petitioner, vs. Blaud Massie; and Sue Erskine Newman, Administratrix &c., et al., Appellants, vs. Ida M. Moyers et al.	Leave granted to file petition for rehearing within thirty days, on motion of Mr. Charles P. Conpaue for the Petitioner in No. 294 and for the appellees in No. 85.
85		

day, June 7th 1920, continued.)

State of Oklahoma, Complainant, vs. State of Texas. The motion for leave to file intervening petition on

of Judsonia Developing association, the Burk Divide Oil Company & and 3, was submitted by Mr. B. Roote in that behalf.

motion for leave to file intervening petition on behalf of Mellish Consolidated Placer Oil Mining Associa- submitted by Mr. J. S. Howard that behalf.

Chief Justice announced the following order.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

No. 27, Original.—October Term, 1919.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, vs. The State of Texas, Defendant; the United States of America, Intervener. } In Equity.

~~(June 7, 1920)~~

The motions of the Judsonia Developing Association, Burk Divide Oil Company No. 2 and others, Burk Divide Oil Company No. 3 and others, and Mellish Consolidated Placer Oil Company, for leave to file petitions in intervention herein, are hereby granted; and similar leave is granted to any and all other parties claiming any title to or interest in the lands in the possession of the Receiver herein by virtue of the orders of April 1, 1920, and June 7, 1920.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday June 7th 1920, contin

No. 27, Original.—October Term, 1919.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
vs.
The State of Texas, Defendant; the United States of America, Intervener.
} In Equity.

~~(June 7, 1920)~~

On consideration of the motion of the United States and the State of Oklahoma, requesting that this cause be set down for hearing at an early day upon certain questions of law, and of the response of the State of Texas to said motion, this day presented

It is ordered that this cause be and it is hereby set down for hearing on the fifteenth day of November, 1920, upon the following questions of law, to wit:

(1) Is the decree of this court in *United States* v. *The State of Texas*, 162 U. S. 1, final and conclusive upon the parties to this cause in so far as it declares that the Treaty of 1819 between the United States and Spain fixed the boundary along the south bank of Red River?

(2) If said decree is not conclusive, then did the Treaty of 1819, construed in the light of pertinent public documents and acts, fix the boundary along the mid-channel of Red River or along the south bank of said river?

It is further ordered that the parties be permitted to take and present testimony in respect of the governmental practice on the part of all governments and States, concerned at the time, bearing upon the construction and effect of said Treaty as to the second question above stated.

The evidence in chief of the United States and the State of Oklahoma shall be taken and closed on or before August 15, 1920; the evidence in chief of the State of Texas shall be taken and closed on or before October 1, 1920; and rebuttal testimony of the part of the United States and the State of Oklahoma shall be taken and closed on or before October 15, 1920. The evidence in each case to be taken on seven days' notice, unless notice is waived.

Ernest Knaebel, Esq., of the District of Columbia, is hereby appointed as Commissioner to take the said evidence and report the same to the court, without findings or conclusions.

Per Mr. Chief Justice W

Order:

It is now here ordered by t
that all the cases on the do
decided and all the other bu
term not disposed of be, and
same are hereby continued
next term.

Per Mr. Chief Justice

Proclamation being made t
is adjourned to the time a
appointed by law.

rowd

f
l
r

l
e
e
d

f
,
d
n
R
e
s

y
rt

hite.

the Court
ocket not
eence of the
r the
to the

, White

the Court
and Place

VOL

19

UME

20

Monday, October 4th, 1920.

At the Capitol of the United States, in the City of Washington, and District of Columbia, being the present seat of the National Government of the United States, on the first Monday of October (being the 4th day of the same month) in the year of our Lord one thousand, nine hundred and twenty and of the Independence of the United States the one hundred and forty-fifth, the Supreme Court of the United States met agreeably to law.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis VanDevanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson, it is ordered that Hugh A. Fisher, Esquire, of Laurel, State of Maryland; James Garfield, Esquire, and Allison L. Newton, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts; Robert P. Frierson, Esquire, of Chattanooga and Morgan C. Smith, Esquire, of Jackson, State of Tennessee; J. G. Weatherly, Esquire, of El Paso, State of Texas and Simon Fleischmann, Esquire of Buffalo, State of New York be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behlaf by Mr. F. D. McKenney it is ordered that Charles MacVeagh, Esquire, of New York City and William Sherman Hay, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. C. Smith, it is ordered that James Green Burleson, Esquire, of Lockhart, and Nat Louis Hardy, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf byMr. E. S. Blodgett, it is ordered that Thomas H. Mahony, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wm. L. Cundiff, it is ordered that Jose P. Laurel, Esquire, of Manila, Philippine Islands be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert L. Hopkins, it is ordered that Frederic Bruce Johnstone, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Abram J. Rose, it is ordered that John B. Grubb, Esquire, of Poughkeepsie, State of New York be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Theodore K. Bryant, it is ordered that Carl V. Wisner, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Needham, it is ordered that Robert E. Quirk, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas L. Blanton it is ordered that E. M. Critz, Esquire, of Coleman, State of Texas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Wells, it is ordered that Willis E. Monty, Esquire of Burlington, State of Vermont, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sowrn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paul E. Leah it is ordered that Joseph L. Egan, Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court is this behalf be Mr. Oscar W. Lange it is ordered that Frank Faircloth, Esquire of Santa Rosa, State of New Mexico be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Amos R. Stallings it is ordered that Joseph I. McMullen, Esquire of San Francisco, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, it is ordered that Alice Asa Allen of Battle Creek, State of Michigan; L. D. Mitchell, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma; and Wm. C. Bacholder, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ben Minor, it is ordered that R. Dulany Whiting, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf byMr. Duncan U. Fletcher it is ordered that W. E. May, Esquire, and John L. Doggett, Esquire, of Jacksonville, and George Earl Hoffman, Esquire of Pensacola, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly..

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. White, it is ordered that James B. Wescott, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois; Cuterbridge Horsey, Esquire of New York City, and Abbot P. Mills, Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Courtin this behalf by Mr. John F. McCarron it is ordered that John E. Hogan, Esquire of Taylorville, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles R. Pierce, it is ordered that Kenneth Edmund Matot, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. I. H. Linton it is ordered that Graham Wright, Esquire, of Rome, State of Georgia, and Charles Fahy, Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis Ottenberg it is ordered that William M. Silverman, Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline it is ordered that Z. Lewis Dalby, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Mr. Attorney General Palmer presented Mr. William L. Frierson, of Tennessee, as Solicitor General of the United States, and it was ordered that his commission be recorded.

Which said commission is in the words and figures following, viz:

"WOODROW WILSON

President of the United States of America,

To all who shall see these presents, Greeting:

KNOW YE; that reposing special trust and confidence in the Integrity and Ability of William L. Frierson of Tennessee, I have nominated and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, do appoint him to be Solicitor General, and do authorize and empower him to execute and fulfil the duties of that Office according to the Constitution and Laws of the said United States and to have and to hold the said Office, with all the powers, privileges and emoluments to the same of right appertaining, unto him, the said William L. Frierson.

In testimony whereof, I have caused
these letters to be made patent and
the seal of the Department of Justice

to be hereunto affixed.

Given under my hand, in the District of Columbia, the first day of June, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and twenty, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty-fourth.

SEAL
DEPARTMENT
OF
JUSTICE.

WOODROW WILSON.

By the President:

A. MITCHELL PALMER,

Attorney General.

The Chief Justice announced that all motions noticed for to-day would be heard to-morrow and the court would then commence the call of the docket pursuant to the twenty-sixth rule.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, October 5th, 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis VanDevanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson, it is ordered that William Delaware Harris, Esquire, of Dayton, State of Ohio be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William M. Bride, it is ordered that Chester H. Lane, Esquire, of New York City and Edwin S. Puller, Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf be Mr. Seth Shepard it is ordered that S. John Block, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. Warner Parker, it is ordered that Charles H. Crocker, Esquire, of Sacramento, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. S. Flannery, it is ordered that Sherman P. Bowers, Esquire, of Frederick, State of Maryland be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. B. .. Andrews it is ordered that Elbert H. Loyd, Esquire, of St. Joseph, State of Missouri, andHarry G. Mellon, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. A. Hoehling, Jr., it is ordered that Frank Taurman, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and Counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. H. Caraway it is ordered that Herbery M. Barney, Esquire, of Texarkana, State of Arkansas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick C. Bryan, it is ordered that David H. Bilder, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. it is ordered that James Mercer Davis, Esquire of Camden, State of New Jersey be admitted to practice as an attorney and Counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wm. B. Kerman, it is ordered that Marion Dorian, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James F. Smith it is ordered that Alexander H. Clark, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank J. Hogan it is ordered that Frederick T. Kelsey, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

John E. Kinnane, United States
Attorney, etc., Appellant,
76 vs.
Detroit Creamery Company et al.;

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
377 vs.
Ben B. Swartz;
and
The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
378 vs.
Jacob M. Smith.

These cases were advanced and assigned for argument Monday, October 11th with Nos. 324, 357 and 367, on motion of Mr. Solicitory General Frierson for the plaintiff in error and appellant.

Oglesby Grocery Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
457 vs.
The United States of America.

This case was advanced for argument on Monday, October 11th, with cases Nos. 324, 357 and 367,.on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the defendant in error.

C. A. Weed and Company,
Appellant,
407 vs.
Stephen T. Lockwood, as United States Attorney for the Western District of New York.

This case was advanced for argument on Monday, October 11th, with cases Nos. 324, 357 and 367, on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the appellee.

The G. S. Willard Company et al.,
Appellants,
418 vs.
A. Mitchell Palmer, Attorney General of the United States et al.

This case was advanced for argument on Monday, October 11th, with cases Nos. 324, 357 and 367, on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the appellees.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error
138 vs.
Picher Lead Company.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District Of Missouri.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson, of counsel for the plaintiff in error and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by the Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
230 vs.
Jacob Wicibdeza (Pleasant Man)

In error to the District Court of the United States for the District of North Dakota.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Alexander Kahn, et al.,
Appellant,
121. vs.
August V. Anderson, Warden,
etc.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the appellee.

Ex parte: In the matter of
Thomas Welsh,
Orig. Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file petition for writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Martin Conboy for the petitioner.

The State of Georgia,
Complainant,
19, Orig. vs.
The State of South Carolina.

On motion of Mr. Hugh H. Obear in behalf of counsel an extension of time was granted in this cause within which to take testimony.

Julius Block,
Petitioner,
510. vs.
Louis Hirsh.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Jesse C. Adkins and Mr. Julius I. Peyser for the petitioner and by Mr. Myer Cohen, Mr. Richard D. Daniels, and Mr. William G. Johnson for the respondent.

W. S. Bullock, Judge, etc.,
et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
362. vs.
The State of Florida ex rel
Railroad Commissioners of the
State of Florida.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John A. Kratz in behalf of Counsel.

H. W. Cargill, as Assessor, etc., et al., Petitioners,
375. vs.
The United States ex rel. Frank Pierce.

The motion to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari herein for want of prosecution was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George B. Pugh for the respondent.

Northern Trust Company, et al., Trustees, etc., Plaintiffs in Error,
345 vs.
Adolph H. Eilers et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ralph R. Duniway for the defendants in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. John Taylor Booze for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

Wesley M. Smith, Petitioner,
471. vs.
W. T. Apple,
for the respondent.

The petition for a writ of certiorati herein was submitted by Mr. John S. Dean and Mr. Thomas F. Doran for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward E. Sapp

United Shoe Machinery Company et al., Appellants,
476 vs.
The United States of America,
and
The United States of America, Appellant,
550 vs.
United Shoe Machinery Company.

The motion to advance and for suspension of injunction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James Garfield in behalf of Mr. Frederick P. Fish, Mr. Cordenio A. Severance and Mr. Charles F. Choate, Jr., for United Shoe Machinery Company et al.

Western Union Telegraph Company, Petitioner,
293 vs.
S. B. Poston.

Leave granted to file brief as amicus curiae on motion of Mr. Louis Ottenberg in that behalf.

Gordon L. Dutcher, petitioner,
319. vs.
Louis M. Sanders,

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Charles P. Pierce and Mr. Marvin W. Conkling for the petitioner.

S. Nakano, Petitioner,
411 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Charles R. Pierce and Mr. Marshall B. Woodworth for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart for the respondent.

Lee U Ong, Petitioner,
527 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Charles R. Pierce in behalf of Mr. Marshall B. Woodworth for the petitioner.

Elizabeth L. Hughes,
Petitioner,
537 vs.
Sara E. Techt, also known as Sarah E. Techt.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Allen C. Rearick for the petitioner, and by Mr. Adolph Bloch for the respondent.

Fred Blackstock, Petitioner,
437 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. L. D. Mitchell and Mr. M. K. Cruce for the petitioner, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. Roy C. McHenry for the respondent.

Grant Smith-Porter Ship Company,
304 vs.
Herman F. Rohde.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander Britton in behalf of counsel for the Grant Smith-Porter Ship Co.

The Missouri Pacific Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error,
265. vs.
McGrew Coal Company.

The motion to dismiss or affirm or transfer to the Summary Docket herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edwin A. Krauthoff for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Edward J. White and Mr. James F. Green for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Director General of Railroads,
Petitioner,
506. vs.
B. M. Moore, Administratrix, etc.

Petition for writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. H. O'B. Cooper, Mr. Clement Manley, Mr. Thomas S. Rollins, Mr. Julius C. Martin and Mr. George H. Wright for the petitioner and by Mr. Felix E. Alley, for the respondent.

Erie Railroad Company and others,
Plaintiffs in Error,
33 to 40. vs.
Board of Public Utility Commissioners
of the City of Paterson, et al.

These cases were passed pursuant to the 26th Rule, on motion of Mr. F. D. McKenney in behalf of counsel.

Berlin Mills Company,
Petitioner,
93. vs.
Procter & Gamble Company.
Charles E. Hughes and Mr. Royall Victor.

Leave granted to file brief of the American Cotton Oil Company as amicus curiae in this cause on motion of Mr. F. D. McKenney in behalf of Mr.

Roy C. Megargel et al.,
Petitioners,
504 vs.
Herman B. Gates et al.
White for the respondents.

The petition for writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Bertram F. Shipman for the petitioners and by Mr. Henry Wollman and Mr. J. Du Pratt

Gertrude M. Reed, Administratrix
etc., Petitioner,
387 vs.
Director General of Railroads et al.

The petition for writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler for the petitioner and by Mr. William Clarke Mason for the respondents.

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
23, Orig. vs.
The State of Texas.

Leave was granted to file the report of the Commissioner in this cause on motion of Mr. Frederick S. Tyler in that behalf.

American Socialist Society,
Petitioner,
484 vs.
The United States of America.
ney General Stewart for the respondent.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. John Block and Mr. Walter Nelles for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attor-

Hartman-Blanchard Company,
Petitioner,
538 vs.
Kittie Ten Eyck et al.

Leave granted to file brief of New York Towboat Exchange as amicus curiae in this cause on motion of Mr. Milton Strasberger in behalf of Mr. Mark Ash.

Tuesday, October 5, 1920, continued.

The Central Railroad Company of New Jersey, Petitioner,
566 vs.
Edna May Knorr.
Rush B. Trescott for the respondent.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. L. T. Michener in behalf of Mr. Charles E. Miller for the petitioner, and by Mr.

The State of Minnesota, Complainant,
13, Orig. vs.
The State of Wisconsin.

The motion for the appointment of a Commissioner in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. C. Fulton in behalf of counsel.

Ex parte In the matter of Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company,
24, Origl. Petitioner.
H. Tracy and Mr. George D. Welles.

Leave granted to file the brief of the Toledo, St. Louis and Western Railway Company as amicus curiae on motion of Mr. E. H. Boles in behalf of Mr. Thomas

Houck Manufacturing Company, (Inc), Petitioner,
477 vs.
Cowen Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Melville Church for the petitioner and by Mr. Isadore Shapiro for the respondent.

Union Tool Company, Petitioner,
521 vs.
Elihu C. Wilson.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Melville Church, Mr. A. V. Andrews, Mr. Frederick S. Lyon, and Mr. William H. White for the petitioner and by Mr. F. ... Clements for the respondent.

Ex parte In the matter of Union Tool Company,
- Orig. Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted by Mr. Melville Church, Mr. A. V. Andrews, Mr. Frederick S. Lyon and Mr. William H. White for the petitioner.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
23, Orig. vs.
The State of Texas.

Leave granted to open evidence, and the case reassigned for December 13th, next on motion of Mr. T. W. Gregory for the defendant.

Anna Heitmuller, Plaintiff in Error,
279 vs.
Sylvanus Stokes.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wharton E. Lester for the defendant in error in support of the motion.

Pueblo of Laguna,
Appellant,
374 vs.
Jose Candelaria et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank W. Clancy for the appellee in support of the motion and by Mr. Francis C. Wilson for the appellant in opposition thereto.

Rosanna McDougall, Administratrix, Petitioner.
328 vs.
The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company.

Petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. L. W. Keplinger for the petitioner.

Herbert L. Hildreth,
Petitioner,
333 vs.
Jim M. Mastoras.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. George P. Dike and Mr. Frederic D. McKenney for the petitioner.

The Virginian Railway Company
Petitioner,
336 vs.
A. L. Mills, Administrator, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Harry T. Hall and Mr. G. A. Wingfield for the petitioner.

Alabama, Vicksburg Railway Company, et al., Plaintiffs in Error
339. vs.
Smith Journey,

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. J. Blanc Monroe, Mr. Monte M. Lemann and Mr. Robert H. Thompson for the plaintiffs in error in support of the petition and by Mr. Robert B. Mayes for the defendant in error in opposition thereto.

Grand Trunk Western Railway Company,
Petitioner,
343 vs.
Mahlon Winget, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. James L. Parrish for the petitioner and by Mr. John D. Mackay for the respondent.

John W. Davidge, petitioner,
344 vs.
Leo Simmons.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Chapin Brown for the petitioner and by Mr. Leo Simmons, pro se.

Miller and Lux, Incorporated, Plaintiff in Error,
347. vs.
The Sacramento and San Joaquin Drainage District.
opposition thereto.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Edward F. Treadwell for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition, and by Mr. Jeremiah F. Sullivan for the defendant in error in

Henry Ching, Petitioner,
351. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Asa V. Call for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and by Mr. William J. Herron for the respondent.

Frank Moore, et al.,
Petitioners,
360 vs.
The State of Arkansas.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Scipio A. Jones for the petitioners.

Frank Hicks, Petitioner,
361 vs.
The State of Arkansas.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Scipio A. Jones for the petitioner.

Isaac S. Dement, et al.,
Petitioners,
368. vs.
James T. Newton, Commissioner of Patents.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Reeve Lewis for the petitioners and by Mr. Assistant attorney General Davis and Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the respondent.

First National Bank of Jasper Florida, Petitioner,
371. vs.
State Bank of Rome, Georgia,;
and
First National Bank of Jasper Florida, Petitioner,
372 vs.
The First National Bank of Rome, Georgia.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. William Wade Hampton for the petitioner and by Mr. Henry C. Clark for the respondents.

Jesse S. Phillips et al., Receivers, etc., Petitioners,
373 vs.
Noel Construction Company, Edgar A. Poe, et al., Receivers, etc. et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Chapman W. Maupin for the petitioners.

The People of the State of New York, Petitioners,
380 vs.
The Hudson River Connecting Railroad Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Claude T. Dawes for the petitioner and by Mr. Robert E. Whalen for the respondent.

Erie Railroad Company, Petitioner
382 vs.
May Pinkney, Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Henry A. Knapp for the petitioner and by Mr. Chester A. Garratt for the respondent.

The Bank of Jasper, Petitioner,
383 vs.
The First National Bank of Rome, Georgia;
and
The Bank of Jasper, Petitioner,
384 vs.
The State Bank of Rome, Georgia.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. F. P. Fleming for the petitioner and by Mr. Henry C. Clark for the respondents.

Speed Mankin, petitioner,
385 vs.
James Bartley
and
Speed Mankin, petitioner,
386 vs.
G. C. Saunders.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. S. H. Sutherland for the petitioner.

Newlin Haines Company, Petitioner,
390 vs.
Edward E. Grosscup, Trustee, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Edward L. Katzenbach and Mr. D. Howard Evans for the petitioner and by Mr. Nathan Bilder and Mr. David H. Bilder for the respondent.

Kansas City Motion Picture Machine Operators. Local No. 170, et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
403 vs.
John E. Hughes et al., doing business under the name of Eastern Theatre.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. William J. Hughes and Mr. Joseph W. Folk for the plaintiffs in error in support of the petition.

James P. Bishop, Administrator, etc., Petitioner,
404 vs.
Frederick A. Delano et al., Receiver, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Fred W. Bentley for the petitioner and by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney and Mr. William Sherman Hay for the respondent.

John Gooch, Jr., Petitioner,
412 vs.
Oregon Short Line Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. J. H. Peterson for the petitioner and by Mr. George H. Smith for the respondent.

Louis Singer, doing business as L. Singer Produce Company, Petitioner,
414 vs.
American Express Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Albert S. Marley for the petitioner, and by Cyrus Crane for respondent.

Benjamin C. Allen, etc., Petitioner,
415 vs.
Philadelphia Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. George Wharton Pepper, Mr. Thomas Patterson, Mr. Robert Woods Sutton, and Mr. H. F. Stambaugh for the petitioner and by Mr. Edwin G. Smith and Mr. George B. Gordon for the respondents.

Lim Chan, petitioner,
416 vs.
Edward White, as Commissioner of Immigration for the Port of San Francisco.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Jackson H. Ralston and Mr. George W. Hott for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

DuPont Engineering Company,

423 vs. Evansville Ice and Storage Company. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr.Thomas J. Tyne for the petitioner and by Mr. W. K. McAlister for the respondent.

Vogt Brothers Manufacturing Company, Petitioner, 426 vs. Ellicott Machine Corporation. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Helm Bruce and Mr. Alexander Galt Barret for the petitioner and by Mr. E. P. Humphrey, Mr. James Piper, Mr. A. P. Humphrey and Mr. William W. Crawford for the respondent.

W. R. Felker et al., partners, etc., et al., Petitioners, 428 vs. The Southern Trust Company, as Trustee, etc., et al. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Dick Rice for the petitioner and by Mr. G. B. Rose, Mr. W. E. Hemmingway, Mr. D. H. Cantrell and Mr. J. F. Loughborough for the respondents.

Pasquale Ciafirdini, petitioner, 431 vs. The United States of America. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. A. B. Quinton for the petitioner and by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the respondent.

Seton C. Bens, petitioner, 432. vs. James M. Power, United States Marshal, etc. respondent. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. George R. Rubin for the petitioner and by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the re-

Mrs. Camilla Davis Putnam, widow, etc., et al., Petitioners, 436 vs. Mrs. Louise Stone Borst. for the respondent. Petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr.Edwin T. Merrick for the petitioners and by Mr. D. R. H. Chaffe and Mr. E. J. Bowers

Gulf Compress Company et al., Petitioners, 438 vs. Merchants Cotton Press and Storage Company. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Thomas A. Evans and Mr. M. G. Evans for the petitioners and by Mr. William P. Metcalf and Mr. C. W. Metcalf for the

Eugene W. Mente, petitioner 447 vs. Mark Bisner, Collector of Internal Reverme, etc. spondent.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Frederic H. Cowden for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the re-
Ross Lumber Company, petitioner, 455 vs. Hughes Lumber Company. Graffenried for the respondent.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. John E. Hall Mr. Warren Grice and Mr. Charles J. Bloch for the petitioner and by Mr. Edward de
Empire Gas and Fuel Company, Petitioner, 456 vs. John G. Wetsel et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. H. O. Caster and Mr. T. P. Garver for the petitioner.
The United States, petitioner, 462 vs. M. Rice and Company et al. General Hanson for the petitioner.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr.Solicitor General Frierson and Mr. Assistant Attorney
William J. Dante, Collector, of the Estate of Stilson Hutchins, deceased, Petitioner, 463 vs. Rose Keeling Hutchins.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. George E. Sullivan for the petitioner.
Los Angeles and Salt Lake Railroad Company, petitioner, 464 vs. The City of Los Angeles; and Los Angeles and Salt Lake Railroad Company, petitioner, 465 vs. The City of Los Angeles.	The petition for writs of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. A. S. Halsted, Mr. Oscar Lawler, Mr. Alexander Britton and Mr. Evans Browne for the petitioners.
White Oak Transportation Company, petitioner,	

Boston, Cape Cod and New York Canal Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Edward E. Blodgett for the petitioner, Mr. Samuel Park and Mr. William N. Sears for the respondent.

The Pullman Company, petitioner,
469 vs.
The State Industrial Commission.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Maurice C. Spratt and Mr. H. Prescott Catley for the petitioner, and by Mr. E. Clarence Aiken for the respondent.

George F. Auf der Heide,
Petitioner,
474 vs.
Anna W. Kiskadden et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Benjamin B. Blakeney and Mr. James H. Maxey for the petitioner.

Mohawk Mining Company,
Petitioner,
475 vs.
Harry H. Weiss, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Alton C. Dustin for the petitioner and by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson and Mrs. Assistant Attorney General Adams for the respondent.

Clinton Mining and Mineral Company, petitioner,
478 vs.
J. S. Blacom.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Arthur O. Fording for the petitioner.

Thomas Welsh, petitioner,
479 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Martin Conboy for the petitioner and by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the respondent.

Pennsylvania Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
485 vs.
Elizabeth Swank, Administratrix etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. George A. Burgeois and Mr. Harry R. Coulomb for the petitioner and by Mr. James Mercer Davis for the respondent.

Northern Coal Company, Petitioner, vs. Boston, Cape Cod and New York Canal Company. 487

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. John G. Palfrey for the petitioner, and by Mr. Samuel Park and Mr. William R. Sears for the respondent.

Frederick B. Lynch, Petitioner, vs. D. Darnell et al., partners as Hazel-Darnell Mule Company. 488 and 489

The petition for writs of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Thomas D. O'Brien Mr. Edward T. Young and Mr. Alexander E. Horn for the petitioner and by Mr. Pierce Butler and Mr. William D. Mitchell for the respondents.

Harry C. Wilson et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 490

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Thomas Ball for the petitioners and by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the respondent.

The Western Union Telegraph Co. Petitioner, vs. Esteve Brothers and Company. 491.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Rush Taggart and Mr. Francis Raymond Stark for the petitioners.

Charles B. Munday, petitioner, vs. The People of the State of Illinois. 494

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. John F. McCarron and Mr. Edward H. Morris and Mr. William J. Hughes for the petitioner.

LaForest L. Simmons, petitioner, vs, Joe Duart. 498

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Edward C. Stone for the petitioner and by Mr. David R. Radovsky for the respondent.

Repetti (Inc), petitioner, vs. Wallace and Company. 500

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Harry D. Nims for the petitioner and by Mr. Frank Chase Somes and Mr. Hugo Mock for the respondent.

Charley Toy et al., petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 501

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Frank Hendrick for the petitioners and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. W. C. Herron for the respondent.

Tiburcio Valverde, petitioner,	The petition for a writ of certiorari
503 vs.	herein was submitted by Mr. Howard
The United States.	Boyd and Mr. James M. Sheridan for
	the petitioner and by Mr. Solicitor
General Frierson for the respondent.	
Bluefields Fruit and Steamship Co.,	The petition for a writ of certiorari
Petitioner,	herein was submitted by Mr. William
507 vs.	C. Dufour, Mr. George Janvier and Mr. C.
Western Assurance Company of Toronto.	Howard McCaleb for the petitioner
and by Mr. John C. Prizer for the respondent.	
Edward S. Atwater, petitioner,	The petition for a writ of certi-
511 vs.	orari herein was submitted by Mr.
Stephen C. Guernsey, et al.	Abram J. Rose for the petitioner and
Trustees, etc., et al.	by Mr. R. D. Whiting for the respon-
	dents.
George Holmes and Frank Miller,	The petition for a writ of certi-
Petitioners,	orari herein was submitted by Mr.
513 vs.	Leander A. Dale and Mr. Frank G.
The United States of America.	Morris and by Mr. Assistant Attor-
ney General Stewart and Mr. Roy C. McHenry for the respondent.	
New York Sanitary Utilization Co.,	The petition for a writ of certi-
Petitioner,	orari herein was submitted by Mr.
514 vs.	DeLancey Nicoll and Mr. Outerbridge
American Engineering Company et al.	Horsey for the petitioner and by
Mr. Frederick T. Kelsey, Mr. William N. Dykman and Mr. Arthur E. Goddard for the respondents.	
Miley Johnson et al., petitioners,	The petition for a writ of certi-
515 vs.	orari herein was submitted by Mr.
Seth Salmon et al.	James M. Hays for the petitioner.
Smith, Bell and Company (Ltd),	The petition for a writ of certi-
Petitioner,	orari herein was submitted by Mr.
516 vs.	Clarence B. Miller for the petit-
Wenceslag Trinidad, Collector, etc.	ioner and by Mr. Solicitor General
Frierson for the respondent.	

Macleod and Company, (Inc),
Petitioner,
517. vs.
Wenceslao Trinidad, Collector, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Clarence B. Miller for the petitioner and by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson and Mr. Charles Marvin for the respondent.

John J. Dimmitt, petitioner,
518 vs.
Glenn L. Breakey,

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. M. M. Crane for the petitioner.

Hulett C. Merritt, petitioner,
519. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. W. H. Anderson Mr. James A. Anderson, Mr. Howard S. Lewis and Mr. Edwin A. Meserve for the petitioner and by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the respondent.

Empire Voting Machine Company,
Petitioner,
522 vs.
The City of Chicago, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorati herein was submitted by Mr. Stephen A. Foster Mr. Herbert Pope and Mr. Frank Keiper for the petitioner and Mr. Horace Kent Tenney, Mr. F. B. Johnstone, Mr. Samuel A. Ettelson and Mr. Leon Hornstein for the respondents.

Frederick C. Taxis et al.,
petitioners,
528. vs.
Universal Form Clamp Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Thomas F. Sheridan for the petitioners and by Mr. William R. Rummler for the respondent.

Marcelino Lontok, petitioner,
529 vs.
The United States,

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Howard Boyd and Mr. James M. Sheridan for the petitioner and by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the respondent.

The Egry Register Company,
Petitioner,
533 vs.
The Standard Register Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. H. A. Toulmin and Mr. H. A. Toulmin, Jr., for the petitioner and by Mr. Alfred M. Allen for the respondent.

Rene Arbib, petitioner,
534 vs.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Merry M. Arnold for the petitioner and by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the respondent.

Galveston, Houston and Henderson Railroad Company, petitioner,
535 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Alex. Britton, Mr. Evans Browne, and Mr. J. W. Terry for the petitioner and by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the respondent.

Elizabeth L. Hughes, petitioner,
537 vs.
Sara E. Techt, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Allan C. Rearick for the petitioner and by Mr. Adolph Bloch for the respondent.

Hartman-Blanchard Company,
Petitioner,
538 vs.
Kittie Ten Eyck et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Pierre M. Brown for the petitioner and by Mr. Chauncey I. Clark for the respondents.

Catherine K. Newton et al.,
Petitioners,
539 vs.
William A. Rhea et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Edward H. S. Martin and Mr. Shepard Barclay for the petitioners, and by Mr. Frank Hagerman and Mr. Thomas Hackney for the respondents.

Luckenbach Steamship Company (Inc), et al.,
Petitioners,
540 vs.
W. R. Grace and Company, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Peter S. Carter and Mr. Oscar R. Houston for the petitioners and by Mr. John M. Woolsey and Mr. Edward R. Baird, Jr., for the respondent.

The First National Bank of Gulfport, Mississippi,
Petitioner,
541. vs.
Wirt Adams, Revenue Agent, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. William H. Watkins for the petitioner.

James F. Bishop, Administrator, etc., et al.,
Petitioners,
542. vs.

Great Lakes Towing Company. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Harry W. Standidge for the petitioners and by Mr. Harvey D. Goulder, Mr. Thomas H. Garry and Mr. Ralph F. Potter for the respondent.

Ephraim Lederer, Collector, etc., Petitioner, vs. Alexander J. Stockton, Sole Surviving Trustee, etc. 543. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the petitioner.

Elliott Frederick, Trustee, etc., Petitioner, vs. The Fidelity Mutual Life Insurance Company of Philadelphia. 547 The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Lowrie C. Barton for the petitioner.

P. M. Hathaway et al., Petitioners, vs. Ford Motor Company. 549. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. John F. Logan for the petitioners and by Mr. Robert Treat Platt and Mr. Harrison G. Platt for the respondent.

The Texas Company, petitioner, vs. Hogarth Shipping Corporation (Ltd), Owner, etc., et al., 555 The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. John W. Griffin for the petitioner and by Mr. John M. Woolsey for the respondents.

Sherwood S. Mattocks, petitioner, vs. Great Lakes Towing Company. 557 The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Edward Maher and Mr. Charles S. Thornton for the petitioner and by Mr. Harvey D. Goulder, Mr. Thomas H. Garry and Mr. Ralph F. Potter for the respondent.

E. Hamilton et al., petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 565 The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Henry Bowden and Mr. George Sutherland for the petitioners and by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the respondent.

Morris Levinson, Appellant, vs. The United States of America. 567. The petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause was submitted by Mr. Russell T. Mount for the appellant in support of the

petition and by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the appellee in opposition thereto.

Chicago and Northwestern Railway Company, petitioner,
570. vs.
C. C. Whitnack Produce Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Wymer Dressler and Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage for the petitioner.

Adams State Bank,
Plaintiff in Error,
3 vs.
The People of the State of Illinois.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion it is now here ordered and adjudged by th s Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Harry Wrongkow Keatley,
Petitioner,
32 vs.
United States Trust Company and Morgan J. O'Brien, as Executors and Trustees under the last will and testament of Herman Wrongkow deceased.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

W. F. Harn and Alice Harn,
Plaintiffs in Error,
59 vs.
Missouri State Life Insurance Company.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

William H. Riggie,
Plaintiff in Error,
153 vs.
Grand Trunk Railway Company.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Vermont.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Chief Justice White.

Eastman Kodak Company et al.,
Appellants,
2 vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was passed per stipulation of counsel pursuant to the 26th Rule.

Associated Billposter and Distributors of the United States and Canada, et al., Appellants,
4 vs.
The United States.

This cause was passed per stipulation of counsel pursuant to the 26th Rule.

The United States, Appellant,
5 vs.
American Can Company et al.

This cause was passed per stipulation of counsel pursuant to the 26th Rule.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
1 vs.
Lehigh Valley Railroad Company et al.

Leave granted three counsel to argue for the appellees. This cause was reargued by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the appellant and by Mr. N. W. Hacker, Mr. F. W. Wheaton and Mr. Edgar H. Boles for the appellees.

American Steel Foundries,

Petitioner,

13 vs.

The Tri-City Central Trades Council et al.

This cause was reargued by Mr. Max Pam for the petitioner and by Mr. Frank C. Smith for the respondents.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, October 6th, 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis VanDevanter,
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. M. King, it is ordered that Andrew W. Spears, Esquire of Pine Bluff, State of Arkansas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

The Northern Pacific Railway Company,
Appellant,
vs.
John Barton Payne, Secretary of the Interior.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

18

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Charles Donnelly, of counsel for the appellant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this court that this appeal be and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Takao Ozawa,
vs.
The United States.

This cause was passed per stipulation of counsel pursuant to the 26th Rule.

20

The United States of America,
Appellant,

21 vs. Southern Pacific Company.	This cause was passed per stipulation of counsel pursuant to the 26th Rule.
Luella Swartwood, as sole Administratrix, etc., Plaintiff in Error, 24 vs. Lehigh Valley Railroad Co.	This cause was passed pursuant to the 26th Rule on motion of Mr. Frederick S. Tyler in behalf of counsel.
John Barton Payne, Secretary of the Interior, et al., Appellants, 17 vs. Central Pacific Railway Company.	This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Nebeker for the appellants and by Mr. A. A. Hoehling and Mr. Frank Thunen for the appellee.
John Barton Payne, Secretary of the Interior, et al., appellants, 128 vs. The State of New Mexico.	This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Nebeker for the appellants and by Mr. Patrick H. Loughran for the appellee.
The State of Wyoming et al., Appellants, 257 vs. The United States of America.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. John H. Lacey for the appellants.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Thursday, October 7th, 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis VanDevanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George F. Wells it is ordered that Eldon R. James, Esquire of Cincinnati, State of Ohio and Walter L. Berry, Esquire of Franklin, State of Tennessee be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney it is ordered that Roy W. Rucker, Esquire, of Sedalia, State of Missouri be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur G. Powell it is ordered that Scott Reed, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas and Sylvan S. Grosner, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

Sarah A. Whittemore, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Maud B. Crawford. — In Error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

248

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error inthis cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Franklin Shaw et al.,
Appellants,
28 vs.
John Barton Payne, Secretary, etc.

This cause was passed per stipulation pursuant to the 26th Rule.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
30 vs.
The Key Stone Watch Case Company;
and
The Key Stone Watch Case Company,
Appellant,
31 vs.
The United States of America.

These cases were passed per stipulation pursuant to the 26th Rule.

Peter L. Wheeler, William B. Bosley and Samuel H. Buteau, as Trustees of Samuel Merritt Hospital,
Plaintiffs in Error,
42 vs.
City of Oakland.

In Error to the District Court of Appeals in and for the First Appellate District of the State of California.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of the said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The State of Wyoming et al.,
Appellants,
257 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. John W. Lacey for the appellants, by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Nebeker for the appellee and concluded by Mr. John W. Lacey for the appellants.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
325 vs.
Northern Pacific Railway Co.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Nebeker for the appellant and by Mr. Charles Donnelly for the appellee.

New York Scaffolding Company,
Petitioner,
22 vs.
Liebel-Binney Construction Co.,
et al.
and
New York Scaffolding Company,
Petitioner,
23 vs.
Chain Belt Company et al.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Frederick P. Fish for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. Wallace R. Lane for the respondents.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Friday, October 8th, 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day,

Willis VanDevanter

Mahlon Pitney,

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

John H. Clarke,

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander H. Clark it is ordered that Eugene Stanley, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson it is ordered that Lee Winchester, Esquire, of Memphis, State of Tennessee, and George L. Boyle, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

Joseph W. Nicholas, Appellant,
47 vs.
The United States.

This cause was passed per stipulation pursuant to the 26th Rule.

Wilson Scott Morris, Appellant,
48 vs.
The United States.

This cause was passed per stipulation pursuant to the 26th Rule.

Louis H. Eberlein, Appellant,
49 vs.
The United States.

This cause was passed per stipulation pursuant to the 26th Rule.

New York Scaffolding Company,
Petitioner,

Leibel-Binney Construction Company et al.,
and
New York Scaffolding Company,
Petitioner,
23 vs.
Chain Belt Company et al.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Wallace H. Lane and Mr. Robert H. Parkinson for the respondents and concluded by Mr. Frederick P. Fish for the petitioner.

Edward B. Pryor et al., as Receivers, etc., Petitioners,
26 vs.
Allsga Williams.

This cause was argued by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney for the petitioners and by Mr. Roy W. Rucker for the respondent.

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company et al., Appellants,
27. vs.
The United States of America et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Claudian B. Northop for the appellants, and continued by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the United States.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, October 11th, 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day,

Willis Van Devanter,

Mahlon Pitney,

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

John H. Clarke,

Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leon Fraser, it is ordered that John A. Mullen, Esquire, and Dudley F. Fowler, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duncan U. Fletcher it is ordered that John Egan Belcher, Esquire, of Tacoma, State of Washington, and James E. Calkins, Esquire, of Tallahassee, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. G. Brantley it is ordered that William M. Howard, Esquire, and Alonzo F. Purdy, Esquire, of Augusta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson it is ordered that Francis Gilbert, Esquire, Eugene D. Boyer, Esquire, and Harry Hertzoff, Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur M. Marsh, it is ordered that James E. Cooper, Esquire, of New Britain, State of Connecticut be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Ciurt in this behalf by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney it is ordered that Philip H. Arrowsmith, Esquire of Florence, State of

South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Z. T. Vinson it is ordered that Robert S. Spillman, Esquire, of Charleston, State of West Virginia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. Granville Munson it is ordered that George P. Hill, Esquire, of New York City and Edward B. Schlant, Esquire of Buffalo, State of New York be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Marbury it is ordered that Alexander Armstrong, Esquire of Hagerstown, and J. Purdon Wright, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Adelbert Moot it is ordered that Welles V. Moot, Esquire of Buffalo, State of New York be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Cortland A. Johnson it is ordered that Robert P. Boyer, Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. C. McMahon it is ordered that Martin C. Frincke, Jr., Esquire, of Berkeley, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chester H. Krum, it is ordered that Louis B. Shor, Esquire of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John H. Lacey it is ordered that John W. Whelan, Esquire and Chiles P. Plummer, Esquire of Casper, State of Wyoming, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hugh H. O'Bear it is ordered that Montreville J. Brown, Esquire of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this

Piedmont and Georges Creek Coal Company, Petitioner,
58 vs.
Seaboard Fisheries Company, Claimant, etc.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of appeals for the First Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be and the same is, hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Rhode Island.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Northern Trust Company, Anna F. Smith, and Charles H. Smith, Trustees, etc., Plaintiffs in Error,
345. vs.
Adolph H. Eilers, Henry J. Eilers, and S. J. McCormick.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Vogt Brothers Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
426 vs.
Ellicott Machine Corporation.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of error herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Vogt Brothers Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
426 vs.

Ellicott Machine Corporation. On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari and for a writ of mandamus herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

IN THE MATTER OF THE SUGGESTED REVISION OF THE ADMIRALTY RULES.

-oOo-

Considering the suggestions made on behalf of the American Bar Association and other organizations as to the necessity for changes in the Admiralty Rules and the character of the amendments deemed to be needed, a committee composed of Mr. Justice McKenna, Mr. Justice Holmes and Mr. Justice Day is hereby appointed, with authority to consider the subject and to report to the Court their recommendations thereon.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

-oOo-

No. 13, Original

STATE OF MINNESOTA, *Complainant*,

vs

STATE OF WISCONSIN, *Defendant*

This cause came on to be heard by this court, on the motions and suggestions of counsel for the respective parties, for the appointment of a commission to run, locate and designate the boundary line between the State of Minnesota and the State of Wisconsin, as indicated in the opinion of this court, delivered on the 8th day of March, A. D. 1920, and thereupon and on consideration thereof—

It is ordered, adjudged, and decreed as follows:

1. That the true boundary line between the complainant and the defendant in and through Lower St. Louis Bay, Upper St. Louis Bay, and the St. Louis River, from Upper St. Louis Bay to the "Falls" in the said river, is as hereinafter specified.

2. That said boundary line must be ascertained upon a consideration of the situation existing in 1846 and accurately described by the Meade chart, more specifically hereinafter referred to.

3. That said boundary line runs from a point midway between Rice's Point and Connor's Point through the middle of Lower St. Louis Bay to and with the deep channel leading to Upper St. Louis Bay and to a point therein immediately south of the southern extremity of Grassy Point, thence west-

ward along the most direct course through water not less than eight feet deep eastward of Fishermen's Island, as indicated by the red trace A-B-C on Minnesota's Exhibit No. 1 (said Exhibit 1 being the Meade chart offered and received in evidence in this suit and now a part of the record), approximately one mile to the deep channel and immediately west of the bar therein, thence with such channel north and west of Big Island up stream to the "Falls."

4. A commission, consisting of Samuel S. Gannett, of Washington, D. C.; William B. Patton, of Duluth, Minnesota; and John G. D. Mack, of Madison, Wisconsin, competent persons, is here and now appointed by the court to run, locate, and designate the boundary line between said States along that portion of said bay and river heretofore described in this decree, and to locate said boundary line by proper monuments, courses, and distances, as fixed by the court in this decree.

5. Before entering upon the discharge of their duties each of said commissioners shall be duly sworn to perform faithfully, impartially, and without prejudice or bias, the duties herein imposed, said oaths to be taken before the clerk of this court or before the clerk of any district court of the United States or before an officer authorized by law to administer an oath in the State of Minnesota or the State of Wisconsin, and returned with their report. Said commissioner is authorized and empowered to make examination of the territory in question and to adopt all ordinary and legitimate methods of survey in the designation of the true location of said boundary line fixed by the decree, to examine and consider carefully the opinion of this court delivered on March 8, 1920, the said Minnesota's Exhibit 1, being the Meade chart, or a certified copy thereof; and said commission shall do all other matters necessary to enable it to discharge its duties and to obtain the end to be accomplished conformably to this decree.

6. It is further ordered that should any vacancy or vacancies occur in said board of commissioners by reason of death, refusal to act, or inability to perform the duties required by this decree, the Chief Justice of this court is thereby authorized and empowered to appoint another commissioner or commissioners to supply such vacancy or vacancies, the Chief Justice acting upon such information in the premises as may be satisfactory to him.

7. It is further ordered that said commissioners proceed with all convenient dispatch to discharge their duties conformably to this decree.

8. It is further ordered that the clerk of this court shall forward at once to the governor of each of said States of Minnesota and Wisconsin and to each of the commissioners hereby appointed a copy of this decree and of the opinion of this court delivered herein March 8, 1920, duly authenticated.

9. Said commissioners shall make a report of their proceedings under this decree as soon as practicable on or before the 1st day of May, 1921, and shall return with their report an itemized statement of services performed and expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties.

10. All other matters are reserved until the coming in of said report or until such time as matters pertaining to this cause shall be properly presented to this court for its consideration.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

W. S. Bullock, Judge, etc., et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
262 vs.
The State of Florida upon the relation of the Railroad Commission of the State of Florida.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 6th, next.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Grant Smith-Porter Ship Company,
304 vs.
Herman F. Rohde.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 6th, next after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Alexander Kahn, Donald Fisher, Robert L. LeCocq, et al., Appellants,
421 vs.
August V. Anderson, Warden of the United States Penitentiary at Levenworth, Kansas.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 6th, next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

United Shoe Machinery Company et al., Appellants,
476 vs.
The United States of America,
and
The United Statesof America,
550 vs.
United Show Machinery Company et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance these causes, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the causes assigned for argument on Monday, January 3d, next.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

United Shoe Machinery Company, et al., Appellants,
476 vs.
The United States of America.
and

The United States of America,
Appellant,
550. vs.
United Shoe Machinery Company
et al.

On consideration of the motion to suspend the operation of an injunction in these cases ordered by the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and said injunction is suspended until the further order of this Court.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte In the matter of
Thomas Welsh,
- Orig. Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte In the matter of the Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company,
24, Orig. Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion of counsel for the Toledo, St. Louis and Western Railroad Company for leave to file brief and make oral argument herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the motion for leave to make oral argument be, and the same is hereby, denied, and that leave to file a brief herein as amici curiae be, and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Missouri Pacific Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error,
265 vs.
McGrew Coal Company.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the Summary Docket.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Anna Heitmuller, Plaintiff in Error,
279 vs.
Sylvanus Stokes.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Pueblo of Laguna, Appellant,

Jose Candelaria et al. It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Alabama, Vicksburg Railway Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
339 vs.
Smith Journey. It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the writ of error.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

John W. Davidge, Petitioner,
544 vs.
Leo Simmons. It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing on the writ of error pending in No. 388.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Miller and Lux, Incorporated,
Plaintiff in Error,
347 vs.
John Barton Payne, Secretary of the Interior, et al. It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the writ of error.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Herbert L. Hildreth, Petitioner,
333 vs.
Jim M. Mastoras. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

First National Bank of Jasper, Florida, Petitioner,
371 vs.
State Bank of Rome, Georgia.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

First National Bank of Jasper, Florida, Petitioner,
372 vs.
The First National Bank of Rome, Georgia.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, It it now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Bank of Jasper, Petitioner,
383 vs.
The First National Bank of Rome, Ga.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Bank of Jasper, Petitioner,
384 vs.
The State Bank of Rome, Georgia.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, It it now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is

hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Gertrude M. Reed, Administratrix of the Estate of Leo C. Reed, deceased, Petitioner, vs. Director General of Railroads, United States Railroad Administration, operating Philadelphia & Reading Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

367

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

John Gooch, Jr., Petitioner, vs. Oregon Short Line Railroad Company.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

412

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court, that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States, Petitioner, vs. M. Rice and Company, and J. G. Meidinger.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals.

462

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs Appeals and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

White Oak Transportation Company, Petitioner,
467. vs.
Boston, Cape Cod and New York Canal Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, It it now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Pullman Company, Petitioner,
469 vs.
The State Industrial Commission.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court, Appellate Division, Third Department, of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court, Appellate Division Third Department, of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Gordon L. Dutcher, Petitioner,
319 vs.
Louis N. Sanders.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the District Court of Appeal, Third District, of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the District Court of Appeal, Third District, of the Stateof California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice.

Rosanna McDougall, Administratrix, etc., Petitioner,
328 vs.
The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

Monday, October 11th, 1920, continued.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Virginian Railway Company, Petitioner,
336 vs.
A. L. Mills, Administrator, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Grand Trunk Western Railway Company, Petitioner,
343 vs.
Mahlon H. Winget, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan and of the argument of Counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Henry Ching, Petitioner,
351 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Frank Hicks, Petitioner,
361 vs.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas and of the argument of counsel thereupon had in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Frank Hicks, Petitioner,
361 vs.
The State of Arkansas.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Isaac S. Dement et al.,
Petitioners,
368 vs.
James T. Newton, Commissioner of Patents.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Jesse S. Phillips et al.,
Receivers, etc., Petitioners,
373 vs.
Noel Construction Company, Edgar A. Poe, et al., Receivers, etc. et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The People of the State of New York, Petitioner, 380 vs. The Hudson River Connecting Railroad Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Erie Railroad Company, Petitioner, 382 vs. May Pinkney, Administratrix, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of, as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Speed Mankin, Petitioner, 385 vs. James Bartley.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had in support of the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Speed Mankin, Petitioner, 386 vs. C. C. Saunders.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Newlin Haines Company,
Petitioner,
390. vs.
Edward E. Grosscup, Trustee of
Newlin Haines Company, Bankrupt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Kansas City Motion Picture Machine Operators, Local No. 170, International Alliance Theatrical Stage Employees et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
403 vs.
John E. Hughes and Wesley H. Briner, co-partners doing business under the name of Eastern Theatre.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

James F. Bishop, Administrator of the Estate of Orville Bordner, deceased, Petitioner,
404 vs.
Frederick A. Delano, William K. Bixby, and Edward B. Pryor, Receivers of the Wabash Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

S. Nakano, Petitioner,
411 vs.

The United States of America. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Louis Singer, doing business as L. Singer Produce Company, Petitioner,
414 vs.
American Express Company. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Kansas City Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Kansas City Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Benjamin C. Allen, in behalf of himself and all other holders of the First Mortgage Bonds of the United Traction Company of Pittsburgh, Petitioners,
415 vs.
Philadelphia Company, Pittsburgh Railways Company et al. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now herecordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Lim Chan, Petitioner,
416 vs.
Edward White, as Commissioner

of Immigration for the Port of San Francisco.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

DuPont Engineering Company, Petitioner,

423 vs.

Evansville Ice and Storage Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

W. R. Folker and J. E. Folker, partners doing business under the firm name of W. R. Folker Construction Company, et al., Petitioners,

428. vs.

The Southern Trust Company, as Trustee, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Pasquale Ciafirdini, Petitioner,

431 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari here-

in to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Seton C. Bons, Petitioner, vs. James M. Power, United States Marshal for the Eastern District of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

432

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Mrs. Camilla Davis Putnam, widow of William S. Parkerson, etc., et al., Petitioners, vs. Mrs. Louise Stone Borst.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

436

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Fred Blackstock, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

437

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Gulf Compress Company and C. C. Hanson, Receiver of the Gulf Compress Company, Petitioners,
438 vs.
Merchants Cotton Press & Storage Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Eugene W. Mente, Petitioner,
447 vs.
Mark Eisner, as Collector of Internal Revenue for the Third District of the State of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ross Lumber Company, Petitioner,
455 vs.
Hughes Lumber Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein into the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Empire Gas and Fuel Company,
Petitioner,
456 vs.

John G. Wetsel et al. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

William J. Dante, Collector of the Estate of Stilson Hutchins, deceased, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

463 vs.

Rose Keeling Hutchins.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Los Angeles & Salt Lake Railroad Company, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

464 vs.

The City of Los Angeles.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Los Angeles & Salt Lake Railroad Company and Guaranty Trust Company of New York, Petitioners, On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

465 vs.

The City of Los Angeles.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

Wesley M. Smith, Petitioner,
471 vs.
W. T. Apple.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

George F. Auf der Heide, Petitioner,
474 vs.
Anna W. Kiskaddon et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Mouch Manufacturing Company, Inc., Petitioner,
477 vs.
Cowen Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second. Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Clinton Mining and Mineral Company, Petitioner,
478 vs.
J. S. Blacom.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Thomas Welsh, Petitioner,
479 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States,
Appellant,
53 vs.
Nederlandsch-Amerikaansche Stoomvart Maatschappij (Holland American Lijn)

It is ordered by the Court that this case be restored to the docket for reargument.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Weeds, Inc., et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
558 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Frierson it is ordered that this case be advanced to be heard with No. 357,

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
208 vs.
Dimitrios J. Theophilatos et al.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
324 vs.
L. Cohen Grocery Company;
and

Harry B. Tedrow, United States Attorney, etc., Appellant,
357 vs.
A. T. Lewis & Son Dry Goods Co. et al.

On motion of Mr. Benjamin F. Spellman in that behalf leave is granted to file the brief of the Lake & Export Coal Corporation as amicus curiae in this cause.

Director General of Railroads,
424 vs.
Vicsose Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, Mr. Henry Wolf Bickle, Mr. F. M. Hivinus, and Mr. Theodore W. Heath for the Director General of Railroads.

Harry S. Mecartney, petitioner,
573 vs.
Bainbridge Colby, Secretary of State et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Harry S. Mecartney pro se and by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the respondent. The motion for hearing upon the application for a writ of certiorari forthwith, and to allow oral argument was submitted by Mr. Harry S. Mecartney pro se.

The Underwood Typewriter Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
215 vs.
Frederick S. Chamberlain, Treasurer.

On motion of Mr. Louis H. Porter, leave is granted to file the brief of the Alpha Portland Cement Company as amicus curiae in this cause.

Harry B. Tedrow, as United States Attorney, et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
357 vs.
The A. T. Lewis & Son Dry Goods Co. et al.

On motion of Mr. William A. Glasgow, Jr., leave is granted to file brief as amicus curiae in this cause.

United Mine Workers of America, et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
239 vs.
Coronado Coal Company et al.

On motion of Mr. Thomas Howes, leave is granted to file brief as amicus curiae in this cause.

Eugene Sol Louie, Petitioner,
337 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Samuel Herrick and Mr. Robert Early McFarland for the petitioner.

Sheldon Dole Lemann et al., Executors, etc., Plaintiffs in Error,
306 vs.
Sidney C. Eastman, Trustee, etc. et al.

Suggestion of diminution of the record and motion for a writ of certiorari herein submitted by Mr. Theodore K. Bryant in behalf of counsel for the defendants in error. The motion of Sidney C. Eastman to dismiss this cause was submitted by Mr. Theodore K. Bryant in behalf of Mr. Carl V. Wisner for the defendants in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Henry W. Lemann for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto. The motion of Northern Trust Company, Administrator, to dismiss this cause was submitted by Mr. Blackburn Esterline in behalf of Mr. Salmon O. Levinson and Mr. Benjamin V. Becker for the defendants in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Henry W. Lemann for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
324. vs.
L. Cohen Grocery Company.

On motion of Mr. Thomas Marioneaux in that behalf, leave is granted to file brief as amicus curiae in this cause.

John C. Robinson et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
43 vs.
The United States of America on behalf of and to the use of Brown-Ketcham Iron Works et al.

This cause was passed pursuant to the 26th Rule on motion of Mr. C. W. Maupin in that behalf.

Jules W. Arndstein, Appellant,
575 vs.
Thomas D. McCarthy, U. S. Marshal.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Rufus S. Day for the appellant.

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
23 Orig. vs.
The State of Texas.

The motion for leave to intervene on behalf of E. Everett Rowell was submitted by Mr. Alexander Britton in that behalf.

Peter L. Wheeler, et al., as Trustees, etc.,
Plaintiffs in error,
42 vs.
The City of Oakland.

The mandate in this cause was granted on motion of Mr. Alexander Britton in behalf of counsel.

The City of New York, Appellant,
311 vs.
The Brooklyn Union Gas Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Harry Hertzoff in behalf of counsel.

The State of North Dakota,
Complainant,
14, Orig. vs.
The State of Minnesota.

Motion to set case for hearing submitted by Mr. Hugh H. O'Bear in behalf of counsel.

Charles S. Fairchild, Appellant,
572 vs.
Bainbridge Colby, Secretary of State et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. William L. Marbury in behalf of counsel.

Andrew P. Lockhart, petitioner,
381 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted By Mr. C. S. Littleton and Mr. Jesse M. Littleton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Frederick Kerr, petitioner,
536 vs.
Frederick Tanini Tagliavia.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. John H. Hazelton for the petitioner and by Mr. William C. Crane for the respondent.

Southern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
561 vs.
Alma R. Miller, Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. E. Randolph Williams, Mr. Henry W. Anderson and Mr. Thomas B. Gay for the petitioner and by Mr. Robert A. Talley for the respondent.

Lewiston Milling Company, (Ltd),
Petitioner.
563 vs.
Ira D. Cardiff et al., copartners, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. James E. Babb for the petitioner and by Mr. Reese H. Voorhees for the respondent.

El Paso and Southwestern Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error,
316 vs.

Robert P. Lovick. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Benjamin F. Bush, Receiver, etc., Petitioner, vs. Albert J. Brunswig. On petition for a writ of certiorari to the Kansas City Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri.

468

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari herein has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Second National Bank of Parkersburg, West Virginia, et al., Appellants, vs. United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

554

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Henry S. DeRees, Appellant, vs. David Costaguta et al., individually, etc. appellees. This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Marion Erwin and Mr. Frederick M. Czaki for the appellant, and by Mr. Walter H. Merritt for the ap-

341

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company, et al., Appellant,
27 vs.
The United States of America et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the United States; by Mr. C. W. Needham for the Interstate Commerce Commission and concluded by Mr. Frank W. Gwathemy for the appellants.

H. Turner et al., Executors, etc., Plaintiffs in Error,
29 vs.
J. P. Wade, Sheriff of Brooks County, Georgia.

This cause was reargued by Mr. A. G. Powell for the plaintiffs in error and by Mr. Graham Wright for the defendant in error.

Jin Fuey Moy, Plaintiff in Error,
44 vs.
The United States of America.
defendant in error.

Argued by Mr. H. Ralph Burton for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the

International Bridge Company, Plaintiff in Error,
46 vs.
The People of the State of New York.

The reargument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Adelbert Moot for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Hughes, it is ordered that Westel W. Willoughby, Esquire of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. A. Hostetler, it is ordered that Joseph N. Nielsen, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

International Bridge Company,
Plaintiff in error,
46 vs.
The People of the State of New York.

The reargument of this cause was continued by Mr. Adelbert Moot for the plaintiff in error; by Mr. James S. Y. Ivins for the defendant in error and concluded by Mrs. Helen Z. M. Rodgers for the plaintiff in error.

Mary L. Greer Conklin, Appellant,
192 vs.
George H. Conklin, et al.

The death of Turner C. Vason one of the appellees herein suggested, and appearance of Anthony J. Salinas, administrator of the said Turner C. Vason, deceased, as a party appellee filed and entered on motion of Mr. William M. Howard in that behalf.

Mary L. Greer Conklin, appellant,
192 vs.

This cause was argued by Mrs. Mary L. Greer Conklin, pro se and by Mr. William M. Howard for the appellees.

Mary L. Greer Conklin, Appellant,
353 vs.
The Augusta Chronicle Publishing Co.
the appellee.

This cause was argued by Mrs. Mary L. Greer Conklin pro se and by Mr. Benjamin Pierce for

Western Union Telegraph Company,
Petitioner,
241. vs.
Addie Speight.

This cause was argued by Mr. Rush Taggart for the petitioner. No. brief filed for the respondent.

H. Snowden Marshal, as Receiver,
etc., Petitioner,
294 vs.
The People of the State of New York.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Francis Gilbert, and Mr. William J. Hughes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Cortland a Johnson and Mr. Robert P. Beyer for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis VanDevanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson, it is ordered that L. Eggertsen Cluff, Esquire of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Weldon Bailey it is ordered that Hugh M. Potter, Esquire of Houston, State of Texas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Webster Ballinger, it is ordered that Nat W. Brown, Esquire of Olympia, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James K. Jones, Jr., it is ordered that Peter Q. Nyce, Esquire of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Frank Staley it is ordered that Horace T. Atkins, Esquire of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. A. Hostetler it is ordered that Howard S. Whitley, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. B. Howe, it is ordered that Harold W. Bissell, Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Charles I. Dawson, Attorney General of the State of Kentucky, et al., Appellants, 439. vs. Kentucky Distilleries Warehouse Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. W. T. Fowler for the appellants.

Charles I. Dawson, as Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants, 582 vs. The J. and A. Freiberg Company (Inc).

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. W. T. Fowler for the appellants.

The United States, petitioner, 271 & 272 vs. National Surety Company.

These cases were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Spellacy and Mr. Leonard B. Zeisler for the petitioner, and by Mr. S. W. Fordyce and Mr. Thomas W. White for the respondent.

William J. Givins, appellant, 285 vs. Fred G. Zerbst, warden, etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. John S. Strahorn for the appellant and submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson and Mr. Robert P. Frierson for the appellee.

William L. Walls, Attorney General, etc., et al., appellants, 219 vs. Midland Carbon Company et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Henry E. Lutz for the appellants and by Mr. John W. Lacey and Mr. Reid L. Carr for the appellees.

Anna H. Watson, et al., as Executors, etc., Plaintiffs in Error, 266 vs.

The State Comptroller of the State of New York.

This cause was argued by Mr. Harold W. Bissell for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. John B. Gleason for the defendant in error.

The Underwood Typewriter Company, Plaintiff in Error,

215 vs.

Frederick S. Chamberlain, Treasurer, etc.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Arthur M. Marsh for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Thursday, October 14th, 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day,

Willis Van Devanter,

Mahlon Pitney,

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

John H. Clarke,

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Spencer Gordon it is ordered that Eugene B. Van Veen, Esquire and Oswald D. Luby, Esquire of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Benjamin Carter it is ordered that Thomas Nelson Woolfolk, Esquire, of Columbus, State of ~~Ohio~~, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Charles D. Newton, Attorney General, etc., et al.,
Appellants,
315 vs.
The Brooklyn Union Gas Company.

This case was passed per stipulation of counsel pursuant to the 26th Rule.

The Underwood Typewriter Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
215 vs.
Frederick S. Chamberlain, treasurer, etc.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. A. M. Marsh for the plaintiff in error, by Mr. James E. Cooper and Mr. Hugh M. Alcorn for the defendant in error and concluded by Mr. Arthur L. Shipman for the plaintiff in error.

Charles E. Smith, Appellant,
199 vs.

Kansas City Title and Trust Company et al. — Four hours allowed for the oral argument of this cause on motion of Mr. Charles E. Hughes in that behalf.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William Marshall Bullitt for the appellant, continued by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the Federal Land Bank of Wichita, Kansas, appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Friday, October 15th, 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol,

Present:-

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day,

Willis Van Devanter,

Mahlon Pitney,

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

John H. Clarke.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard J. Van Deusen, it is ordered that Ulpiano Crespo, Jr., Esquire of Arcoibo, Porto Rico, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander Britton it is ordered that Hugh C. Gearin, Esquire of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. M. C. Elliott it is ordered that John H. Holliday, Esquire, and William H. Woodward Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

Harry S. Mecartney, petitioner,
573 vs.
Bainbridge Colby, Secretary, etc.,
et al.

On motion of Mr. W. C. Sullivan for the petitioner, leave is granted to file reply brief in this cause.

The Atlantic Coast Electric Railway Company, plaintiff in Error,
50 vs.
Board of Public Utility Commissioners
of the State of New Jersey et al.

In error to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that this is the second term at which this cause has been called for argument, and that neither party is now prepared to argue the same, it is considered by the Court that this cause should be dismissed at the costs of the plaintiff in error pursuant to the 19th Rule of this Court.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Missouri, Kansas and Texas Railway Company, Appellant,
52 vs.
The United States.

This cause was passed per stipulation of counsel pursuant to the 36th Rule.

Charles E. Smith, Appellant,
199 vs.
Kansas City Title and Trust Company et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. George W. Wickersham for the First Joint Stock Land Bank of Chicago, appellee, and concluded by Mr. Frank Hagerman for the appellant.

United Mine Workers of America et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
239 vs.
Coronado Coal Company et al.
error.

This cause was argued by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the plaintiffs in Error and by Mr. Henry S. Drinker, Jr., and Mr. James B. McDonough for the defendants in

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, October 18th, 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day,

Willis Van Devanter

Mahlon Pitney,

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

John H. Clarke,

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson it is ordered that John M. Sternhagen, Esquire; Eldred E. Jacobsen, Esquire; Drew W. Hageman, Esquire; Frederic Conger, Esquire, of New York City; Paul Campbell, Esquire; Joseph W. Thompson, Esquire; Charles C. Moore, Esquire, of Chattanooga, State of Tennessee; Guy Mason, Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia, and G. Noble Jones, Esquire, of Savannah, State of Georgia be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. W. Witten it is ordered that Harley Phillips Mathewson, Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Will R. King it is ordered that John Manning, Esquire of Portland, State of Oregon be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank K. Nebeker it is ordered that George N. Murdock, Esquire of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., it is ordered that Raymond H. O'Brien, Esquire, of Findlay, State of Ohio be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Hughes it is ordered that John Quinn, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. T. Michener it is ordered that J. A. Wolfson, Esquire, of Manila, Philippine Islands be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Levi Cooke, it is ordered that A. Julius Freiberg, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Mary L. Greer Conklin, Appellant, Appeal from the District Court of the
192 vs. United States for the Southern District
George H. Conklin et al. of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Mary L. Greer Conklin,
Appellant, Appeal from the District Court of the
353 vs. United States for the Southern District
The Augusta Chronicle Publish- of Georgia.
ing Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Georgia and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and de-

creed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte in the matter of the Union Tool Company, - Original Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Eugene Sol Louie, Petitioner,
337 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 6th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Director General of Railroads et al.,
424 vs.
The Viscose Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 6th, next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Charles I. Dawson, Attorney General of the State of Kentucky, Appellants,
439 vs.
Kentucky Distilleries and Warehouse Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 6th, next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Charles I. Dawson, Attorney General of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, and individually, Louisville Public Warehouse Company, et al., Appellants,
582. vs.

The J. & A. Freiberg Company, Incorporated.. On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby, granted and the case assigned for argument on Monday, December 6th, next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Jules W. Arnstein, Appellant, 575 vs. Thomas D. McCarthy, United States Marshal for the Southern District of New York. On consideration of the motion to advance and assign this cause for argument on Tuesday, the 19th instant, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The City of New York, Appellant, 311 vs. The Brooklyn Union Gas Company. On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court, that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Charles S. Fairchild, Appellant, 572 vs. Bainbridge Colby, Secretary of State of the United States, et al. On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The State of North Dakota, Complainant, 14, Original. vs. The State of Minnesota. On consideration of the motion to fix a day for the hearing of this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 3d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, 23 Original. vs. The State of Texas, Defendant, The United States, The motion of E. Everett Rowell for leave to intervene is granted, but with the restriction that such intervention shall not delay the approaching hearing or general questions in the cause and that as respects that hearing this intervenor must

rely upon the evidence already taken and reported to the Court. Other parties to the cause are granted ten days within which to answer the petition of this intervenor.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Western Union Telegraph Company, Petitioner,
491 vs.
Estevo Brothers & Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered the this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Edward S. Atwater, Petitioner,
511 vs.
Stephen C. Guernsey, et al., Trustees, etc.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Union Tool Company, Petitioner,
521 vs.
Elihu C. Wilson.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it it now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Mohawk Mining Company,
Petitioner,
475 vs.

Harry H. Weiss, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Eighteenth District of Ohio. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

American Solialist Society, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

484

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, It it now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Elizabeth Swank, Administratrix of Herbert L. Swank, deceased. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

485

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Frederick B. Lynch, Petitioner, vs. D. Darnell et al., partners as Hazel-Darnell Mule Company. — On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

488

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the

argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Frederick B. Lynch, Petitioner,
489 vs.
D. Darnell et al., partners as Hazel-Darnell Mule Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Harry C. Wilson and Cleo Wilson, Petitioners,
490 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Charles B. Munday, Petitioner,
494 vs.
The People of the State of Illinois.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Laforest L. Simmons, Petitioners,
498 vs.
Joe Duart.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Superior Court of the State of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein

to the Superior Court of the State of Massachusetts, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Nepetti, Inc., Petitioner, vs. Wallace and Company. 500

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Charley Toy and Lee Gip, Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 501

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of Counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Tiburcio Valverde, Petitioner, vs. The United States; 503

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Roy C. Megargel and Ralph G. Megargel, doing business under the firm name and style of R. C. Megargel & Company, Petitioners,

Herman B. Gates, Joseph M. Eccles, et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White,

Director General of Railroads, Petitioner, vs. Mrs. B. M. Moore, Adminixtratrix of B. M. Moore, deceased. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

506

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Bluefields Fruit & Steamship Company, Petitioner, vs. Western Assurance Company of Toronto. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

507

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Julius Block, Petitioner, vs. Louis Hirsh. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

510

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

George Holmes, and Frank Miller, Petitioners,
513 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

New York Sanitary Utilization Company, Petitioner,
514 vs.
American Engineering Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Miley Johnson and Elizabeth Deere Smith, Petitioners,
515 vs.
Seth Salmon and J. C. Eaton.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Smith Bell and Company, Limited, Petitioner,
516 vs.
Wenceslao Trinidad, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Philippine Islands.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Macleod & Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
517 vs.
Wenceslao Trinidad, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Philippine Islands.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

John J. Dimmitt, Petitioner,
518 vs.
Glenn L. Breakey.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Empire Voting Machine Company,
Petitioner,
522 vs.
The City of Chicago, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Hulett C. Merritt, Petitioner,
519 vs.

The United States of America. It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until after the hearing in Nos. 324, 357, and 367.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Chief Justice announced that the Court will take a recess from Monday, the 25th instant, to Monday, November 8th next.

J. W. Goldsmith, Jr.-Grant Company, Plaintiff in Error,
214 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the defendant in error.

American Steel Foundries, Petitioner,
131 vs.
James T. Newton, Commissioner of Patents,

On motion of Mr. George L. Wilkinson in that behalf, it is ordered that Robert White, be substituted as the party respondent herein in place of James T. Newton, resigned.

James J. Rafferty, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Philippine Islands, Petitioner,
544 vs.
Smith, Bell and Company, Ltd.;
and
James J. Rafferty, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Philippine Islands, Petitioner,
548 vs.
Compania General de Tabacos de Filipinas;
and
James J. Rafferty, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Philippine Islands, Petitioner,
553 vs.
Visayan Refining Company.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Charles Marvin for the petitioner, with leave to counsel for the respondents to file brief on or before November 6th, next.

Commissioners of Road Improvement District No. 2 of Lafayette County, Arkansas, Petitioners, 552 vs. St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Henry Moore, Jr., for the petitioners.
Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner, 564 vs. Emma Haulerson. George C. Badell for the respondent.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. William M. Jackson for the petitioner and by Mr. A. H. King, Mr. Roswell King and Mr.
Elizabeth Prentiss, Petitioner, 569 vs. Mark Misner, Collector of Internal Revenue.	The petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit submitted by Mr. Royall Victor and Mr. Philip L. Miller for the petitioner and by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Adams for the respondent.
J. E. Brewer et al., Petitioners, 576 vs. Postal Telegraph Cable Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Albert S. Marley for the petitioners.
The United States, Appellant, 33 vs. Nederlandsch-Amerikaansche Stoomvart Maatschappij.	This cause was passed per stipulation of counsel pursuant to the 36th Rule.
James A. Peterson, Plaintiff in Error, 56 vs. The United States of America.	In error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota and Mr. Solicitor General Frierson, of counsel for the defendant in error having filed a confession of error and moved the Court to reverse the judgment herein,

It is therefore, in pursuance of said confession and motion, now here ordered, and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
275 vs.
James Butt alias Wong Sing.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the plaintiff in error. No brief filed for the defendant in error.

William E. Johnson,
plaintiff in error,
289. vs.
The State of Maryland.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. W. C. Herron for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. J. Purdon Wright and Mr. Alexander Armstrong for the defendant in error and concluded by Mr. W. C. Herron for the plaintiff in Error.

John C. Heald et al., Committee of the person and estate of Eugene Peters.
300 vs.
The District of Columbia.

The argument of this cause was commenced by by Vernon G. West for Heald et al., etc.; continued by Mr. F. H. Stephens for the District of Columbia and concluded by Mr. A. S. Worthington for Heald et al., etc.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
324 vs.
L. Cohen Grocery Company.
Defendant in error.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the plaintiff in error; continued by Mr. Louis B. Shor and Mr. Chester H. Krum for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 11 o'clock.

Tuesday, October 19th, 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Hughes, it is ordered that Roy Baker, Esquire, of Rockville, State of Indiana, and Harvey D. Hinman, Esquire and Thomas B. Mattell, Esquire of Binghamton, State of New York be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. Edward Wright it is ordered that Hugh McCurdy, Esquire of San Francisco, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. A. Hostetler, it is ordered that Max W. Davis, of Elizabeth, State of New Jersey; Joseph W. Milburn, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia and Robert M. Zacharias, Esquire, of Chambersburg, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

* * * * * * See page 88.

The United States of America,
plaintiff in error,
324. vs.
L. Cohen Grocery Company.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Chester H. Krum for the defendant in error.

Tuesday, October 19th, 1920, continued.

Harry B. Tedrow, U. S. Attorney,
etc., Appellant,
357, vs.
The A. T. Lewis & Son Dry Goods
Company et al.;

H. Z. Kennington et al., Appellants,
367 vs.
A. Mitchell Palmer, et al.;

John E. Kinnane, U. S. Attorney,
etc., Appellant,
376 vs.
Detroit Creamery Company et al.;

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
377 vs.
Ben B. Swartz;

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
378 vs.
Jacob M. Smith;
A. Reed & Company, Appellant,
407 vs.
Stephen T. Lockwood, U. S. Attorney
etc.;

The G. S. Willard Company et al.,
Appellants,
408 vs.
A. Mitchell Palmer, Attorney General,
etc., et al.;

Hesby Grocery Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
417 vs.
The United States of America,
and
Goods, Inc., et al., plaintiffs in error

Three hours were allowed to each side for the argument of these cases. The argument was commenced by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the appellant in 357, the appellees in 367, the appellant in 376, the plaintiff in error in 377 and 378, the appellees in 407 and 418, and the defendant in error in 457 and 558; continued by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the appellees in 357 and 376, the defendants in error in 377 and 378, and the plaintiffs in error in 558; by Mr. C. C. Dorsey for the appellees in 357 and by Mr. Garner Wynn Green for the appellants in 367.

558 vs.

The United States of America.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Nathan B. Williams it is ordered that Harold R. Young, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, October 20th, 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis VanDeVanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,

Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened:

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edgar Watkins, it is ordered that William V. Ford, Esquire of Luray, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this byhalf by Mr. Charles E. Hughes it is ordered that Chester R. Dewey, Esquire, of Utica, State of New York be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Louis B. Nagler,
Plaintiff in Error,
64 vs.
The United States of America.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Wisconsin and Mr. Solicitor General Frierson, of counsel for the defendant in error, having filed a confession of error and moved the Court to reverse the judgment herein, It is therefore, in pursuance of said confession and motion, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Harry B. Tedrow, U. S. Attorney, etc., Appellant,
357 vs.
The A. T. Lewis & Son Dry Goods Company et al.;

H. M. Kennington et.al., Appellants,
367 vs.
A. Mitchell Palmer, et al.;

John Z. Kinnane, U. S. Attorney, etc., Appellant,
376 vs.
Detroit Creamery Company, et al.;

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error,
377 vs.
Ben B. Swartz;

The United States of America, Plaintiff in error,
378 vs.
Jacob M. Smith;

C. A. Wood & Company, Appellant,
407 vs.
Stephen T. Lockwood as United States Attorney, etc.;

The G. S. Willard Company et al., Appellants,
418 vs.
A. Mitchell Palmer, as Attorney General etc.;

Oglesby Grocery Company, Plaintiff in Error,
457 vs.
The United States of America;

and

Woods, Inc., et al., plaintiffs in error,
558 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Edgar Watkins for the plaintiff in error in 457, by Mr. Simon Fleischmann for the appellant in 407, by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the appellants in 357 and 376, the appellees in 367 and 407, and 418, the plaintiff in error in 377 and 378, and the defendants in error in 457 and 558; and concluded by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the appellees in 357 and 376, the defendants in error in 377 and

378 and the plaintiff in error of 338, and submitted by Mr. William L. Day for the appellants in 418.

Western Union Telegraph Company, petitioner,
293 vs.
S. B. Poston.

This cause was argued by Mr. Rush Targart and Mr. Francis Raymond Stark for the petitioner and by Mr. Philip H. Arrowsmith for the respondent.

American Column and Lumber Company et al., Appellants,
369 vs.
The United States of America.

Two hours allowed each side for the argument of this case on motion of Mr. C. Carroll Todd in that behalf. Argument commenced by Mr. C. Carroll Todd for the appellants.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Thursday, October 21st, 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke. Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson it is ordered that Edward George Kirby, Esquire; and Frank Pearis Kennison, Esquire of Toledo, State of Ohio, and Sam Wynne Maples, Esquire of Chattanooga, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank S. Bright it is ordered that Jackson B. Kemper, Esquire of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. LaRue Brown it is ordered that Elias Field, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts; Nicholas Kelley, Esquire and Seymour Parker Gilbert, Jr., Esquire of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

Bartholomew Sullivan et al., Appellants,
65 vs.
Jane Kidd.

On motion of Mr. Jackson H. Ralston for the appellee it is ordered that this case be passed pursuant to the 26th Rule.

American Column and Lumber Company et al., Appellants,
369 vs.

Thursday, October 21st, 1920, continued.

The United States of America. — The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Henry S. Mitchell for the appellee and concluded by Mr. Louis Clair Boyle for the appellants.

Ana Maria Sugar Company (Inc), Petitioner,
54 vs.
Tomas Quinones. — This cause was argued by Mr. E. Crosby Kindleberger for the petitioner and submitted by Mr. Jorge V. Dominguez for the respondent.

Postal Telegraph Cable Company, Petitioner,
57 vs.
J. L. Dickerson. — This cause was argued by Mr. W. W. Millan for the petitioner and submitted by Mr. William D. Anderson for the respondent.

Midland Linseed Company, Plaintiff in Error,
60 vs.
American Liquid Fireproofing Company et al. — This cause was argued by Mr. Denis M. Kelcher for the plaintiff in error and submitted by Mr. Fred P. Carr for the defendants in error.

Ada C. Mongrain, Plaintiff in error,
61 vs.
W. H. Aaron et al. — This cause was submitted by Mr. Preston A. Shinn for the plaintiff in error with leave to counsel for the defendants in error to file brief within 30 days.

The People of the State of New York ex rel Troy Union Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error,
63 vs.
G. Frank Mealy et al., etc. — This cause was submitted by Mr. William L. Visscher and Mr. Lewis E. Carr for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. George B. Wellington for the defendants in error.

Jules W. Arndstein, Appellant,
575 vs.
Thomas D. McCarthy, U. S. Marshal, etc. — The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Rufus S. Day for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Friday, October 22d, 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke.
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles V. Imlay it is ordered that Glen E. Huntsberger, Esquire of Los Angeles, State of California and George W. Offutt, Jr., Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Rufus S. Day, it is ordered that William J. Fallon, Esquire, and Benjamin I. Shiverts, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

Lillian Nicchia, Plaintiff in Error,
74 vs.
People of the State of New York.

This cause was passed pursuant to the 26th Rule on motion of Mr. Clarence R. Wilson in that behalf.

Joseph Gilbert, Plaintiff in Error,
79 vs.
The State of Minnesota.

This cause was passed per stipulation of counsel pursuant to the 26th Rule.

Jules W. Arndstein, Appellant,
575 vs.
Thomas D. McCarthy, U. S. Marshal, etc.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Rufus S. Day for the appellant, continued by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the appellee and concluded by Mr. William J. Fallon for the appellant.

Miles-Bement-Pond Company, Appellant, 69 vs. Iron Moulders Union, Local No. 68, et al.	This cause was argued by Mr. Lawrence Maxwell and Mr. Murray Seasongood for the appellant, and by Mr. W. B. Rubin and Mr. Robert J. Shank for the appellees.
The Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Company. 70 vs. Isabel H. Johnson.	This cause was submitted by Mr. George Lines for the Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Company and by Mr. S. F. Prouty for Isabel H. Johnson.
National Life Insurance Company of Montpelier, Vermont, 71 vs. A. M. Miller, Administrator, etc.	This cause was submitted by Mr. George B. Young for National Life Insurance Company and by Mr. S. F. Prouty for A. M. Miller, Administrator, etc.
Jane Field, Appellant, 73 vs. The United States.	This cause was argued by Mr. William M. Scott for the appellant and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Davis for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis VanDeventer,
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Attorney General Palmer it is ordered that Joseph McCormack, Esquire, of Erie, State of Pennsylvania be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson it is ordered that William F. Norman, Esquire, of Chattanooga, State of Tennessee; John G. Rauch, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana; and James L. Fort, Esquire, of Danville, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler it is ordered that Joseph M. Ryan, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Western Union Telegraph Company,
Petitioner,
241. vs.
Addie Speight.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said supreme court for further proceedings not

inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

J. W. Goldsmith, Jr.-Grant Company, Plaintiff in Error,
214 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 6th, next, after the causes heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

H. W. Cargill, as Assessor, etc., et al., Petitioners,
375 vs.
The United States ex rel. Frank Pierce.

On consideration of the motion to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari herein for the want of prosecution, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied, without prejudice.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The First National Bank of Gulfport, Mississippi, Petitioner,
541 vs.
Wirt Adams, Revenue Agent of the State of Mississippi.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ephraim Lederer, Collector of Internal Revenue for the First District of Pennsylvania, Petitioner,
543 vs.
Alexander J. Stockton, Sole Surviving Trustee under the Will of Alexander J. Derbyshire, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein

to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Texas Company, Petitioner,
555 vs.
Hogarth Shipping Corporation, Limited, Owner of the Steamship "Baron Ogilvy, and Hugh Hogarth & Sons.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Chicago and Northwestern Railway Company, Petitioner,
570 vs.
C. C. Whitnack Produce Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska and of the argument of counsel in support of the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Elliott Frederick, Trustee, in Bankruptcy of the Estate of John E. Schmidt, Petitioner,
547 vs.
The Fidelity Mutual Life Insurance Company of Philadelphia.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania and of the argument of counsel thereupon had in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Commissioners of Road Improvement District No. 2 of Lafayette County, Arkansas, Petitioners,
552 vs.
St. Louis Southwestern Railway Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel in support of the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Lee U. Ong, Petitioner,
527 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Frederick C. Taxis, Patented Devices Company and Metal Building Materials Company, Petitioners,
528 vs.
Universal Form Clamp Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Marcelino Lontok, Petitioner,
529 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

The Egry Register Company, Petitioner,
533 vs.
The Standard Register Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Rene Arbib, Petitioner,
534 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Galveston, Houston & Henderson Railroad Company, Petitioner,
535 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Elizabeth L. Hughes, Petitioner,
537 vs.
Sara E. Techt, also known as Sarah E. Techt.

On petition for writ of certiorati to the Court of Appeals of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of New York and of the argument of counsel thereupan had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here

ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Catherine K. Newton, William H. Whitlock and Blanche H. Whitlock, Petitioners,
vs.
William A. Rhea and Mont B. Mining Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

539

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Luckenbach Steamship Company, Incorporated, and Luckenbach Company, Incorporated, Petitioners,
vs.
W. R. Grace & Company, Incorporated.

On petition for writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

540

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of, as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

James P. Bishop, Administrator of the Estate of Samuel Benn, deceased et al., Petitioners,
vs.
Great Lakes Towing Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

542

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

F. M. Hathaway et al., Petitioners,
549 vs.
Ford Motor Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Central Railroad Company of New Jersey, Petitioner,
556 vs.
Edna May Knorr.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Sherwood S. Mattocks, Petitioner,
557 vs.
Great Lakes Towing Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

E. Hamilton, A. Wright, H. Lanke et al., Petitioners,
565 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is

hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Morris Levinson, Appellant,
567 vs.
The United States of America
and S. Harry Johnson.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Andrew P. Lockhart, Petitioner,
381 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Frederick Kerr, Petitioner,
536 vs.
Frederick Tanani Tagliavia.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Southern Railway Company
Petitioner,
561 vs.
Alma H. Miller, Administratrix
of the Estate of E. L. Miller,
deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and of the Argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Lewiston Milling Company, Ltd., Petitioner,
563 vs.
Ira D. Cardiff, Alfred P. Johnson, M. A. Roberts and A. M. Hathaway, copartners as Ira D. Cardiff & Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Hartmann-Blanchard Company, Petitioner,
538 vs.
Kittie Ten Eyck and Director General of Railroads, operating The Pennsylvania Railroad.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner,
564 vs.
Emma Raulerson.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Elizabeth S. Prentiss, Petitioner,
569 vs.
Mark Eisner, Collector of Internal

Revenue, Third District of New York. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

J. E. Brewer and C. S. Brewer, Petitioners, vs. Postal Telegraph Cable Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Kansas City Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri.

576

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Kansas City Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Chief Justice White.

Harry S. Mccartney, Petitioner, vs. Bainbridge Colby, Secretary of State, and Henry L. Bryan, Editor of Laws. — On consideration of the motion to be heard orally on the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

573

Harry S. Mccartney, Petitioner, vs. Bainbridge Colby, Secretary of State, and Henry L. Bryan, Editor of Laws. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

573

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Franklin Shaw, et al., Appellants,
28 vs.
John Barton Payne, Secretary of the Interior.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the appellee in support of the motion and by Mr. Charles A. Towne and Mr. Duanne E. Fox for the appellants in opposition thereto.

The United States of America,
plaintiff in error,
206 vs.
James H. Strang et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the plaintiff in error.

United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation,
plaintiff in error,
440 vs.
Joseph M. Kinney.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the plaintiff in error.

Charles W. Steene et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
249 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the defendant in error in support of the motion and by Mr. Seymour Stedman for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

The United States, Appellant,
442 vs.
Stanley Field, as Executor, &c.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the appellant.

Lambert Run Coal Company,
Appellant,
585 vs.
The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Frank E. Harkness for the appellant.

The State of New Mexico,
Complainant,
22, Original. vs.
The State of Colorado.

On motion of Mr. Frederick S. Tyler in behalf of counsel for the complainant, leave is granted to file replication to the answer of the defendant, to file answer ~~the~~ to the cross-bill, and to file motion to strike out parts of answer of the defendant to the bill of complainant.

The Auglaize Box Board Company,

Monday, October 25th,,1920, continued.

217 vs. Bessie Minton, etc., et al.

Motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. M. Cooke and Mr. T. T. Ansberry for the defendants in error in support of the motion and by Mr. Earl M. Turner for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Chichagoff Mining Company, Petitioner, 568 vs. John Tuppola. respondent.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John P. Gray for the petitioner and by Mr. J. M. Cobb for the

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, November 8th, next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, November 8th, 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day,

Willis VanDevanter,

Mahlon Pitney,

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

John H. Clarke,

Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. L. Worys, it is ordered that John A. Millener, Esquire of Columbus, State of Ohio be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry E. Davis it is ordered that Henry L. Berger, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. H. Small it is ordered that Edmund C. Borden, Esquire, of New York City and George Bayard Jones, Esquire of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Rufus S. Day, it is ordered that Henry B. Potter, Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf be Mr. Alfred Lucking it is ordered that Clarence E. Wilcox, Esquire, and Thomas G. Long, Esquire of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline it is ordered that Charles S. Lawrence, Esquire of Nashville, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Niles-Bement-Pond Company, Appellant, vs. Iron Moulders Union Local No. 68 et al. 69

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of the United States for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be h eard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, a djudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Niles-Bement-Pond Company, Appellant, vs. Iron Moulders Union Local No. 68 et al. 69

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, granted, the transcript of record on appeal to stand as a return to the writ.

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Niles-Bement-Pond Company, Petitioner, vs. Iron Moulders Union Local No. 68 et al. 69

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Pitney

Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Wells Brothers Company of New York,

Appellant,

75 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel,

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

William C. Street, Appellant,

278 vs.

Lincoln Safe Deposit Company and Daniel L. Porter. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that this cause be and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States forfurther proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court,

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds concurs in the result.)

The United States, Petitioner,

271 & 272 vs.

National Surety Company. On writ of certiorari to the United State Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this

cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Julos W. Arnstein, Appellant,
575 vs.
Thomas D. McCarthy, United States Marshal for the Southern District of New York.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York and was argued by counsel,

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

(Mr. Justice Day took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company, Seaboard Air Line Railway, Southern Railway Company and Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Appellants,
27 vs.
The United States of America, The Interstate Commerce Commission, and The Richmond Chamber of Commerce.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia and was argued by counsel,

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

per Mr. Justice Day.

H. Turner and S. Morton Turner, Executors of the Estate of J. O.

Morton, deceased, Plaintiffs in Error,
29 vs.
J. P. Wade, Sheriff of Brooks County, Georgia.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel,

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and and the the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Day.

The People of the State of New York on the relation of the Troy Union Railroad Company, plaintiff in error,
63 vs.
G. Frank Mealy, George Spence, Jr., George B. Walker, and Silas Downs, Jr., as Assessors, and Hiram W. Gordinier, as Comptroller of the City of Troy, State of New York.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

William E. Johnson, Plaintiff in Error,
289 vs.
The State of Maryland.

In Error to the Circuit Court of Frederick County, State of Maryland.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Circuit Court, of Frederick County, State of Maryland, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Circuit Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed, with costs; and that this cause be, and the same

is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Pitney,

Mr. Justice McReynolds.

New York Scaffolding Company,
Petitioner,
22 vs.
Leibel-Bissey Construction Company and George R. Whitney, Sr., Administrator of the Estate of Egbert Whitney, deceased.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and was argued by counsel,

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

New York Scaffolding Company,
Petitioner,
23 vs.
Chain Belt Company and George R. Whitney, Administrator of the Estate of Egbert Whitney, deceased.

On writ of certiorari herein to the United States for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit and was argued by counsel,

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decrees of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals and of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Wisconsin in this cause be, and the same are hereby, reversed at the costs of the petitioner; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, re-

New York Scaffolding Company,
Petitioner,
19 vs.
George R. Whitney, Sr., as Administrator, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
275 vs.
James Butt, alias Wong Sing.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, and was argued by counsel,

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Edward B. Pryor and Edward F. Kearney, Receivers of the Wabash Railroad Company,
Petitioners,
26 vs.
Alloga Williams.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri and was argued by counsel,

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court. per Mr. Justice McKenna.

John C. Heald, George E. Hamilton and Wilton J. Lambert, Committee of the person and estate of Eugene Peters,

300 vs.

The District of Columbia.

On a certificate from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that said certificate be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Franklin Shaw and John F. Palmer, Appellants,

28 vs.

John Barton Payne, Secretary of the Interior.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel,

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Postal Telegraph Cable Company, Petitioner,

57 vs.

J. L. Dickerson.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Midland Linseed Company, Plaintiff in Error,

60 vs.

American Liquid Fireproofing Com-

City, Iowa, and Chicago Great Western Railroad Company. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa and was argued by counsel,

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Jane Field, Appellant,

73 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel,

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Auglaize Box Board Company, Plaintiff in Error, In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

217 vs.

Bessie Hinton (now Bessie Whitehead) and the Bloomer Brothers Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel,

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Sheldon Dole Leman, Frances M. Leman Carpenter, and Henry W. Leman, as Executors of the Last Will of Frances E. Dole Leman, deceased, Plaintiffs in error,

306 vs.

Sidney C. Eastman, Trustee, etc., et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
206 vs.
James H. Strang et al.;
and
United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation,
Plaintiff in Error,
440 vs.
Joseph M. Kinney.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, December 6th, next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States, Appellant,
442 vs.
Stanley Field, as Executor of the Estate of Nate Field, deceased.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 6th, next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Lambert Run Coal Company,
Appellant.
585 vs.
The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Charles W. Steene et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
249 vs.
The United States of America.

It is ordered by the Court that the the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Chichagoff Mining Company,
Petitioner,
568 vs.
John Tuppela.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Felix Gouled.
250 vs.
The United States.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the United States.

Victor L. Berger, et al.,
460 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the United States.

W. H. Humphreys, as Administrator etc., Plaintiff in Error,
349 vs.
Bates and Rogers Construction Co.

The motion to affirm or plane on the Summary Docket in this cause was submitted by Mr. Edwin A. Swingle, Mr. B. L. Worthington and Mr. LeWright Browning for the defendant in error in support of the motion and by Mr. Alan D. Cole for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Hugh Reilly, Plaintiff in Error,
502 vs.
Robert Shipman et al. etc.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted by Mr. Guy Mason, Mr. W. W. Spalding, Mr. S. B. Davis, Jr., and Mr. H. H. Wright for the defendants in error in support of the motion and by Mr. Frank Faircloth and Mr. Harry L. Patton for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Detroit United Railway, Appellant,
492 vs.
City of Detroit et al.

The motion to advance this cause or for an injunction pending the hearing was submitted by Mr. Elliott G. Stevenson, Mr. John C. Donnelly, Mr. William L. Carpenter, Mr. P. J. Hally and Mr. H. H. Spalding for the appellant.

Detroit United Railway, Appellant,
492 vs.
City of Detroit et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted by Mr. Alfred Lucking and Mr. Clarence E. Wilcox for the appellees in support of the motion and by Mr. Elliott G. Stevenson, Mr. John C. Donnelly, Mr. William L. Carpenter, Mr. P. J. H. Hally, Mr. H.H. Spalding and Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the appellant in opposition thereto.

Jules W. Arndstein, Appellant,
575 vs.
Thomas D. McCarthy, U. S. Marshal, etc.

On motion of Mr. George L. Boyle for the appellant, the mandate in this cause was ordered to issue forthwith.

P. Lorillard Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
599 vs.
National Steam Navigation Company, Limited, of Greece.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. John G. Milburn, Mr. Charles E. Carpenter and Mr. D. Roger Englar for the petitioners and by Mr. J. Parker Kirlin and Mr. Cletus Keating for the respondent.

Washington Railway and Electric Company, Petitioner,
596 vs.
George C. Stuart.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. John S. Barbour for the petitioner.

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
23, Original. vs.
The State of Texas.

The third report of the receiver was filed on motion of Mr. John Spalding Flannery of counsel for the Receiver.

Samuel C. Mackson, petitioner,
591 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Abner H. Ferguson for the petitioner and by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the respondent.

Charles M. Hogan, Appellant,
120 vs.
William H. O'Neill, Chief of Police, etc.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court pursuant to the 20th Rule by Mr. Reuben D. Silliman for the appellant and by Mr. Joseph C. Pelletier for the appellee.

The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, Plaintiff in error,
157 vs.
Daniel J. Perry.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted by Mr. Ed. S. Vaught and Mr. J. H. Everest for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. C. O. Blake, Mr. R. J. Roberts, Mr. John W. Willmott and Mr. W. R. Bleakmore for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Cornelius C. Watts et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
359 vs.
The State of Arizona at the relation, etc., of Ignatius Burgoon, Treasurer, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Herbert Noble and Mr. Joseph W. Bailey for the plaintiffs in error in support of the petition.

Fernand Vaughn Gasquet,
Petitioner,
566 vs.
George F. Lapeyre et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. J. C. Gilmore, Mr. William Winans Wall and Mr. G. T. Fitzhugh for the petitioner.

The Kansas City Southern Railway Company, Petitioner,
574 vs.
Nick Meinen.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. S. W. Moore, Mr. James B. McDonough and Mr. A. P. Smith for the petitioner.

Chapin-Saks Manufacturing Co.,
Petitioner,
584 vs.
The Mendler-Creamery Company et al. the respondent.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Walter A. Johnston and Mr. F. M. Phelps for the petitioner and by Mr. Vernon Cook for

Roberts Cone Manufacturing Company et al., Petitioners,
597 vs.
Frederick A. Bruckman et al.
E. Dieterich for the respondents.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. H. A. Toulmin and Mr. H. A. Toulmin, Jr., for the petitioners and by Mr. Albert

William Parent, Andrew Parent,
Arthur Parent and Josie Marsh,
Children and Heirs of Josephine
Parent, deceased, Appellants, Appeal from the United States Circuit Court
92 vs. of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.
Irene L. Simmons Picotte.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellants to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Lakewood Engineering Company, In error to the United States Circuit
Plaintiff in Error, Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.
102 vs.
The New York Central Railroad Co.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Gertrude Groot, In error to the Court of Appeals of the
Plaintiff in Error, District of Columbia.
218 vs.
Carolina I. Reilly.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Rock Island, Arkansas and Louisiana
Railroad Company, Appellants,
82 vs.
The United States.

Monday, November 8th, 1920, continued.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas P Littlepage and Mr. Sidney P. Taliaferro for the appellant and by Mr.Solicitor General Frierson for the appellee.

Benjamin Bond, plaintiff in error,
83 vs.
Augusta E. Walters.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. D. W. Clark and Mr. Harry A. Hegarty for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. John W. Preston and Mr. John C. Brooke for the defendant in error.

Frank C. Thornton et all,
plaintiffs in error,
76 vs.
Thomas J. Duffy et al., etc.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Judson Harmon for the plaintiffs in error, continued by Mr. Timothy S. Hogan and Mr. B. W. Gearhart for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. Arthur I. Vorys for the plaintiffs in error.

George D. Horning, Petitioner,
77 vs.
The District of Columbia.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Henry E. Davis for the petitioner and continued by Mr. Robert L. Williams for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Tuesday, November 9th, 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis VanDevanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

John C. Neald et al., Committee etc.
300 vs.
The District of Columbia.

On motion of Mr. A.S. Worthington for Neald etc., et al., it is ordered that the mandate in this cause issue forthwith.

Tony Tschin and Fred Fedotoff,
Plaintiffs in Error,
220 vs.
The State of New Jersey.

In error to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiffs in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

George D. Horning, Petitioner,
77 vs.
The District of Columbia.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Robert L. Williams for the respondent and concluded by Mr. Henry E. Davis for the petitioner.

Albert J. Bothwell et al.,
Appellants,
78 vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. Charles H. Merillat for the appellants and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Davis for the appellee.

Jesse O. Starr et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
80 vs.
The State of New Mexico.

This cause was argued by Mr. Henry B. Holt for the plaintiffs in error and submitted by Mr. Harry S. Bowman for the defendant in error.

The State of Louisiana ex rel.
Thomas J. Duggan, etc.,
Plaintiff in Error,
81 vs.
A. W. Crandell, Register of the State Land Office.

This cause was argued by Mr. Henry H. Glassie for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Paul A. Sompayrac for the defendant in error.

T. M. Duché & Sons, Ltd.,
Petitioner,
84 vs.
American Schooner "John Twohy" her tackle, etc., Albert D. Cummins et al., Claimants.

This cause was argued by Mr. William J. Conlen for the petitioner. No brief filed for the respondents.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, November 10th, 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day,

Willis VanDevanter,

Mahlon Pitney

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

John H. Clarke,

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Thaddeus Terry it is ordered that Forrest M. Anderson, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., it is ordered that Logan W. Marshall, Esquire, of Dayton, State of Ohio be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur Hollen, it is ordered that Joseph A. Bates, Esquire, and William B. Moulton, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois and George M. Morris, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jesse B. Roote it is ordered that Hiram W. Hodgers, Esquire of Anaconda, State of Montana be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Edward P. Jackman,

Plaintiff in error,

94 vs.

The Rosenbaum Company.

This cause was passed per stipulation of counsel pursuant to the 26th Rule.

Lewis M. Haupt, Appellant,
85 vs.
The United States.
Appellee.

This cause was argued by Mr. Benjamin Carter for the appellant and by Mr. Daniel L. Morris for the appellee.

Joseph Gilbert, Plaintiff in Error,
79 vs.
The State of Minnesota.

This cause was argued by Mr. George Nordlin and Mr. Frederick A. Pike for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. James E. Markham for the defendant in error.

The Journal and Tribune Company,
Appellant,
86 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Benjamin Carter for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Thursday, November 11th, 1920,

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day,

Willis VanDevanter,

Mahlon Pitney,

James C. McReynolds,

John H. Clarke,

Frank M. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf be Mr. Samuel Herrick, it is ordered that R. Allen Stephens, Esquire, of Danville, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf be Mr. J. C. Brandenburg, it is ordered that James R. Dougherty, Esquire of Beeville, State of Texas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf be Mr. Harlan F. Stone, it is ordered that Martin Taylor, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made tothe Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward J. Colladay, it is ordered that Charles W. Darr, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. V. Cushman it is ordered that Albert C. Aiken, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The American Telephone and Telegraph
Company of Baltimore City,

108 vs. The State Roads Commission of Maryland.

In error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company of Baltimore City, Plaintiff in error,

119 vs.

The State Roads Commission of Maryland.

In error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now hereordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Louis M. Haupt, Appellant,

85 vs.

The United States.

On motion of Mr. Benjamin Carter, leave is granted to file reply brief for the appellant within three days.

The Journal and Tribune Company, Appellant,

86 vs.

The United States.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Benjamin Carter for the appellant and concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Davis for the appellee.

The United States of America, Appellant,

87 vs.

The Diamond Coal and Coke Co.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Nebeker for the appellant and by Mr. E. B. Rodgers for the appellee.

The United States, Petitioner,

88 vs.

Northern Pacific Railway Company. The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. [illegible] Assistant Attorney General, [illegible] for the petitioner and continued by Mr. S. T. Ayers for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Friday, November 12th, 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis VanDevanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Frank H. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson, it is ordered that Paul G. Gravemeret, Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first Made to the Court in this behalf be Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., it is ordered that Francis W. Treadway, Esquire of Cleveland, State of Ohio, and Allan R. Smith, Esquire, of Hartford, State of Connecticut be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

Max W. Stoehr, etc., Appellant,
546 vs.
James M. Wallace et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the appellees.

The United States, Petitioner,
88 vs.
Northern Pacific Railway Co.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. D. F. Lyons for the respondent and concluded by Mrs. Assistant Attorney General Adams for the petitioner.

Joseph H. Sampliner,
Plaintiff in Error,
89 vs.
Motion Picture Patents Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. John C. White for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Samuel Seabury for the defendant in error.

Great Western Serum Company,
Appellant,
90 vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. Edwin H. Cassels for the appellant, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Davis for the appellee.

El Banco Popular de Economias y Prestamos de San Juan, P. R. Appellant,
91 vs.
Elias B. Wilcox.

This cause was argued by Mr. Boyd B. Jones, for the appellant, and by Mr. Ben A. Matthews for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, November 15th, 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day,

Willis VanDevanter,

Mahlon Pitney,

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

John H. Clarke,

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jesse C. Adkins it is ordered that James R. Sheppard, Jr., Esquire, of Richmond, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson, it is ordered that Merwin C. Bobst, Esquire, of Miami and Curtis D. Shillingworth, Esquire, of West Palm Beach, State of Florida, and Webster Sproles, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander Britton, it is ordered that Louis Kleindienst, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Hughes, it is ordered that Frank H. Sommer, Esquire, of Newark, and Francis Scott, Esquire, of Paterson, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick C. Taylor, it is ordered that Arthur E. Paige, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

The Underwood Typewriter Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Frederick S. Chamberlain, Treasurer of the State of Connecticut. — In error to the Superior Court of the State of Connecticut.

215

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Superior Court of the State of Connecticut, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Superior Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Anna H. Watson and Frederick Watson, as Executors of the Last Will and Testament of Charles W. Watson, deceased, Plaintiffs in error, vs. The State Comptroller of the State of New York. — In error to the Surrogate's Court of New York County, State of New York.

266

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Surrogate's Court of New York County, State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Surrogate's Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Annie Harris, formerly Annie Francis et al., Appellants, vs. Merry H. Bell, et al. — Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

51

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of [illegible]

The Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Company,
70 vs.
Isabel H. Johnson.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the first question certified must be answered in the affirmative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

(Mr. Justice Day took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

National Life Insurance Company of Montpelier, Vermont,
71 vs.
A. M. Miller, Administrator of the Estate of George P. Johnson, deceased.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the first question certified must be answered in the affirmative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

(Mr. Justice Day took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

Jesse O. Starr and Charles Schmidt, Plaintiffs in Error,
80 vs.
The State of New Mexico.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction, per Mr. Chief Justice [illegible]

The State of Louisiana ex rel.
Thomas J. Duggan, now deceased,
and represented by T. A. Duggan,
Administrator of his Succession,
Plaintiff in Error,
81 vs.
A. W. Crandell, Register of the
State Land Office.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Benjamin Bond, Plaintiff in Error,
83 vs.
Augusta E. Walters.

In error to the Court of Appeals for the First Appellate District, Division One, State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals for the First Appellate District, Division One, State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

W. H. Humphreys, as administrator of Kelley Grannison, deceased,
Plaintiff in Error,
349. vs.
Bates and Rogers Construction Company.

In error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky and on motion to affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Victor L. Berger, et al.,
460 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 6th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Felix Gouled,
250 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 3d, next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Max W. Stoehr, suing in his own behalf as a stockholder in Stoehr & Sons, Inc., and in behalf of all others similarly situated, Appellants,
546 vs.
James N. Wallace et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 3d, next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Detroit United Railway,
Appellant,
492 vs.
City of Detroit et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 3d next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Detroit United Railway, Appellant,
492 vs.
City of Detroit et al.

On consideration of the motion for an injunction in this case, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Detroit United Railway, Appellant,
492 vs.
City of Detroit et al.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, Plaintiff in error,
157. vs.
Daniel J. Perry.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the case on the merits. per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Seaboard Air Line Railway, Appellant,
62 vs.
The United States.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be restored to the docket for reargument. per Mr. Chief Justice White.

James J. Rafferty, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Philippine Islands, Petitioner,
544 vs.
Smith, Bell & Company, Limited.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.
per Mr. Chief Justice White.

James J. Rafferty as Collector of Internal Revenue for the Philippine Islands, Petitioner,
548. vs.
Compania General de Tabacos de Filipinas.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.
per Mr. Chief Justice White.

James J. Hafferty, as Collector of Internal Revenue for the Philippine Islands, Petitioner,
553 vs.
Visayan Refining Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Cornelius C. Watts et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
359 vs.
The State of Arizona at the relation, etc., of Ignatius Burgoon, Treasurer, etc.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Fernand V. Gasquet, Petitioner,
566 vs.
George F. Lapeyre and J. Martial Lapeyre.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is, hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Kansas City Southern Railway Company, Petitioner,
574 vs.
Nick Meinen.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Chapin Cake Manufacturing Company, Petitioner, vs. The Mendler Creamery Company and Manuel Mendler. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

584

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Samuel C. Jackson, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

591

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the Argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Washington Railway and Electric Company, Petitioner, vs. George C. Stuart. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

596

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Roberts Cone Manufacturing Company et al., Petitioner, vs. Frederick A. Bruckman et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

597

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it

is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per. Mr. Chief Justice White.

P. Lorillard Company et al.,
Petitioners,
599 vs.
National Steam Navigation Company, Limited, of Greece.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

por Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Chief Justice announced that the Court will take a recess from Monday, the 22d instant to Monday, December 6th, next.

The United States of America,
ex rel C. E. Sykes,
plaintiff in error,
135.. vs.
John Barton Payne, Secretary of the Interior.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Nebeker and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Underwood for the defendant in error in support of the motion and by Mr. H. A. Ledbetter and Mr. Francis W. Clements for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

LaBelle Iron Works, Appellant,
453 vs.
The United States.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the appellee.

Truman H. Newberry et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
559 vs.
The United States.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the appellee with consent thereto by Mr. Charles E. Hughes of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

The United States of America,
ex rel Harry S. Mccartney,
plaintiff in error.

588 vs.
Bainbridge Colby, Secretary of State et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. W. C. Sullivan for the plaintiff in error.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
23, Original. vs.
The State of Texas.

The motion for leave to file petition of the General Oil Company for an order requiring the Receiver to restore certain property, was submitted by Mr. A. H. Carrigan for the General Oil Company.

United Zinc and Chemical Company, petitioner,
603 vs.
Van Britt and Susie Britt.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Henry D. Ashley for the petitioner.

Ex parte In the Matter of The State of New York et al.,
- Origl. petitioners,

The motion for leave to file petition for writ of prohibition and / or a writ of mandamus herein was submitted by Mr. George A. King for the petitioners.

Ex parte In the Matter of The State of New York and the People of the State of New York as owners of the steam tug "Queen City",
- Origl. Petitioners,.

The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of prohibition and / or a writ of mandamus herein was submitted by Mr. George A. King for the petitioners.

The Texas Company, petitioner,
555 vs.
Hogarth Shipping Company, Ltd., etc., et al.

A motion for leave to intervene and for leave to file brief as amicus curiae and to be heard in this cause was submitted by Mr. Charles A. Conlon in behalf of Mr. Frederic R. Coudert and Mr. Howard Thayer Kingsbury for the British Embassy.

Sarah Mary Wall, Administratrix etc., Plaintiff in error,
237 vs.
The Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company.
opposition thereto.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted by Mr. Worth B. Caylor for the defendant in error in support of the motion and by Mr. Almon A. Bulkley and Mr. C. E. More for the plaintiff in error in

H. W. Cargill, as Assessor, etc., et al., Petitioners,

375 vs. The United States ex rel Frank Pierce.

The motion to dismiss the petition for writ of certiorari herein for want of prosecution was submitted by Mr. George B. Pugh for the respondent in support of the motion.

The First National Bank of Aiken,
594 vs. Petitioner,
The J. L. Mott Iron Wroks.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. William S. Nelson for the petitioner and by Mr. D. S. Henderson for the respondent.

Pacific Mail Steamship Company,
595 vs. Petitioner,
J. Lucas.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Charles J. Hegarty for the petitioner and by Mr. Frederick Clayton Peterson for the respondent.

Galveston, Harrisburg & San Antonio Railway Company, petitioner,
100 vs.
L. H. Woodbury et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. J. Beall for the petitioner and by Mr. Rufus B. Daniel for the respondents.

Berlin Mills Company, Petitioner,
93 vs.
Proctor and Gamble Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Marcus B. May for the petitioner, continued by Mr. Livingston Gifford for the respondent and concluded by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Tuesday, November 16th, 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:-

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis VanDevanter,
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Davis Jr., it is ordered that Frank E. Scott, Esquire of Emory, State of Virginia, and Charles H. Graves, Esquire, of Toledo, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George P. Foulk, it is ordered that William H. Wack, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Charles I. Dawson, Attorney
General of the State of Kentucky,
et al., Appellants,
439 vs.
Kentucky Distilleries Warehouse
Company;

and

Charles I. Dawson, Attorney General
of the State of Kentucky et al.,
Appellants,
582 vs.
The J. & A. Freiberg Company, Inc.

On motion of Mr. Levi Cooke for the appellees, it is ordered that these cases be reassigned for argument on Monday, January 3d, 1921.

Erie Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error,
33 vs.

Board of Public Utility Commissioners of the City of Paterson, et al.;

Erie Railroad Company, plaintiff in error,

34 vs.

The Board of Public Utility Commissioners of the City of Paterson et al.;

Passaic Water Company, plaintiff in error,

35 vs.

The Board of Public Utility Commissioners of the City of Paterson et al.;

Western Union Telegraph Company, Plaintiff in error,

36 vs.

The Board of Public Utility Commissioners of the City of Paterson et al.;

D. Fullerton and Company, plaintiff in error,

37 vs.

The Board of Public Utility Commissioners of the City of Paterson et al.;

Jacob Meyer et al., etc., plaintiffs in error,

38 vs.

The Board of Public Utility Commissioner of the City of Paterson et al.;

Morris and Company, plaintiff in error,

39 vs.

The Board of Public Utility Commissioner of the City of Paterson, et al.;

Public Service Railway Company, plaintiff in error,

40 vs.

The Board of Public Utility Commissioners of the City of Paterson et al.;

Four and one half hours were allowed for the argument of these cases on motion of Mr. George S. Hobart in that behalf. The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. George S. Hobart for the plaintiffs in error in Nos. 35 to 39 inclusive; continued by Mr. Frank Bergen for the plaintiff in error in No. 40; by Mr. L. Edward Herrmann and Mr. Frank H. Sommer for the defendants in error, and by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the plaintiffs in error in Nos. 35 to 39, inclusive.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:-

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day,

Willis Van Devanter,

Mahlon Pitney,

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

John H. Clarke,

Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick W. Lehmann, it is ordered that Ethelbert V. Crabill, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Erie Railroad Company, plaintiff in error,

33 vs.

The Board of Public Utility Commissioners of the City of Paterson et al.;

Erie Railroad Company, plaintiff in error,

34 vs.

The Board of Public Utility Commissioners of the City of Paterson et al.;

Passaic Water Company, plaintiff in error,

35 vs.

The Board of Public Utility Commissioners of the City of Paterson et al.;

Western Union Telegraph Company, plaintiff in error,

36 vs.

The Board of Public Utility Commissioners of the City of Paterson et al.;

D. Fullerton and Company, plaintiff in error,

37 vs.

The Board of Public Utility Commissioners of the City of Paterson et al.;

Jacob Meyer, et al., etc., plaintiffs in error,

38 vs.

The Board of Public Utility Commissioners of the City of Paterson et al.;

Morris and Company, plaintiff in error,

39 vs.

The Board of Public Utility Commissioners of the City of Paterson, et al.;

Public Service Railway Company, plaintiff in error,

40 vs.

The Board of Public Utility Commissioners of the City of Paterson et al.

The argument of these cases was concluded by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the plaintiffs in error in Nos. 33 to 39, inclusive.

John Vallely, as trustee, etc.,

96 vs.

Northern Fire & Marine Insurance Company.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Rome G. Brown for Vallely, Trustee, and by Mr. M. C. Young for the Insurance Company.

The United States of America on the relation of Verdine R. Hall,

plaintiff in error,

95 vs.

John Barton Payne, Secretary of the Interior.

This cause was argued by Mr. Patrick H. Loughran for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Nebeker for the defendant in error.

Lillian Nischia, plaintiff in error,

74 vs.

The People of the State of New York.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. George P. Foulk for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

The United States, appellant,

53 vs.

Nederlandsche-Amerikaansche Stoomvart Maatscha pij (Holland American Lijn).

This cause was re-argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Davis for the appellant and by Mr. Howard Mansfield for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Thursday, November 18th, 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Melville Church, it is ordered that Harold E. Lippincott, Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Economy Light and Power Company,
Appellant,
104 vs.
The United States of America.

It is ordered that this cause be passed per stipulation of counsel pursuant to the 26th Rule.

Emma Bornhardt et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
109. vs.
Lewis Perry.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause having been called hearing in its regular order and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Thames Towboat Company,
Appellant,
97 vs.

The Schooner "Francis McDonald" her tackle, etc.
Mark Ash for the appellee.

This cause was argued by Mr. Samuel Park for the appellant and by Mr.

The City of Newport, appellant,
98 vs.
Howard Heckerman et al., etc.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Brent Spence for the appellant. No appearance was entered for the appellees.

James A. Owenby, plaintiff in error,
99 vs.
John Pierpont Morgan, et al., Executors, etc.
fendants in error.

This cause was argued by Mr. Louis Marshall for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Willard Salisbury and Mr. Harlan F. Stone for the de-

The Coca-Cola Company, Petitioner,
101 vs.
The Koke Company of America, et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Frederick W. Lehmann for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Friday, November 19, 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis VanDevanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank H. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey it is ordered that Daniel V. Mahoney, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Frank R. Lopez, Appellant,
146 vs.
Frederick C. Howe, as Commissioner of Immigration at the port of New York.

The motion to dismiss this cause was submitted by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart, Mr. Solicitor General Frierson, and Mr. Harry S. Midgely for the appellee in support of the motion.

Yee Bow, plaintiff in error,
110 vs.
The City of Cleveland et al.

This cause was passed per stipulation of counsel pursuant to the 26th Rule.

The Baldwin Company, Petitioner,
113 vs.
R. S. Howard Company.

This cause was passed per stipulation of counsel to be heard with No. 139.

The Coca-Cola Company, petitioner,
101 vs.
The Koke Company of America et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Richard E. Sloan and Mr. Joseph W. Bailey for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. Frederick H. Lehmann for the petitioner.

Robert B. Brown, petitioner,
103 vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was argued by Mr. James M. Dougherty and Mr. Edwin C. Brandenburg for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart for the respondent.

Pere Marquette Railway Company, petitioner,
105 vs.
J. F. French and Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Oscar E. Waer for the petitioner and by Mr. Clare J. Hall for the respondent.

Southern Pacific Company, petitioner,
106 vs.
W. S. Berkshire, Administrator, etc.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William I. Gilbert and Mr. W. F. Herrin for the petitioner and by Mr. C. B. Rudspeth and Mr. George E. Wallace for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, November 22d, 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,

Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
} Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Attorney General Palmer it is ordered that Michael Francis Doyle, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania and Raymond S. Norris, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson, it is ordered that Edwin C. Reed, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia and Robert Remy Slaughter, Esquire, of Woodlawn, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Henry Butler, it is ordered that John T. Dooling, Esquire, George M. Lanning, Esquire, and Saul S. Myers, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert C. Hume, it is ordered that Everett N. Bullock, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler it is ordered that Albert Elias Miller, Esquire of Laurel, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by L. Melendez King, it is ordered that Elisha Scott, of Topeka, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

International Bridge Company,
46 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The People of the State of New York.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:

The Chief Justice,
Mr. Justice McKenna,
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

George D. Horning, Petitioner,
77 vs.
The District of Columbia.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Brandeis,
The Chief Justice,
Mr. Justice Day,
Mr. Justice McReynolds also dissents.

Rock Island, Arkansas & Louisiana
Railroad Company, Appellant,
82 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record

from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Frank R. Lopez, Appellant,
146 vs.
Frederick C. Howe, as Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of New York.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Frank R. Lopez, Appellant,
146 vs.
Frederick C. Howe, as Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.
per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The City of Newport, Appellant,
98 vs.
Howard Hockerman and William F. Hockerman, Partners, doing business under the name of Queen City Bottling Works.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the recordfrom the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings.

Hugh Reilly, Plaintiff in Error,
502 vs.
Robert Shipman, U. S. Thompson, and Robert L. Lewis, doing business under the firm name and style of Shipman and Thompson.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

LaBelle Iron Works, Appellant,
453 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 31, next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Truman H. Newberry et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
559 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 3d, next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States of America ex rel. Harry S. Mccartney, Plaintiff in Error,
588 vs.
Bainbridge Colby, Secretary of State, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied. per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States of America ex rel.
C. E. Sykes, Plaintiff in Error,
135 vs.
John Barton Payne, Secretary of the Interior.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the perits.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Sarah Mary Wall, Administratrix etc., Plaintiff in Error,
237 vs.
Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company.
on the merits.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.
per Mr. Chief Justice White.

W. H. Cargill, as Assessor etc.,- et al., Petitioners,
375 vs.
The United States ex rel. Frank Pierce.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the motion of counsel for the respondent to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, for want of prosecution,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for want of prosecution.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The First National Bank of Aiken, Petitioner,
694 vs.
The J. L. Mott Iron Works.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Pacific Mail Steamship Company, Petitioner,
595 vs.
J. Lucas.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby,

United Zinc and Chemical Company,
603 vs. Petitioner,
Van Britt and Susie Britt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

The Texas Company, Petitioner,
555 vs.
Hogarth Shipping Corporation, Limited, etc., et al.

On consideration of the motion of counsel for leave to file brief and participate in the oral argument of this cause, as amici curiae,

It is now here ordered by the Court that leave to file brief be, and the same is hereby, granted, and that leave to participate in the oral argument be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte In the Matter of The State of New York, The People of the State of New York, Edward S. Walsh, Superintendant of Public Works of the State of New York, and Edward S. Walsh,
--- Original. Petitioners,

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of prohibition and / or a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte In the Matter of the State of New York, The People of the State of New York, Edward S. Walsh, Superintendant of Public Works of the State of New York and Edward S. Walsh,
--- Original Petitioners,

On consideration of the petition for a writ of prohibition and / or a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that cause be shown by the District Court of the United States for the Western District of New York, the Honorable John R. Hazel, the Judge thereof, and the Officers thereof, before this Court, at Washington, on Monday, the 13th of December, A. D. 1920, at 12 o'clock noon of that day, or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard, why the prayer of the said petition should not be granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex Parte in the Matter of the State of New York and The People of the State of New York, Owners of the Steam Tug "Queen City", Petitioners, ---- Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of prohibition and / or a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte In the Matter of the State of New York and The People of the State of New York, Owners of the Steam Tug, "Queen City", --- Original. Petitioners.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of prohibition and / or a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that cause be shown by the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York, the Honorable John R. Hazel, the Judge thereof, and the Officers thereof, before this Court, at Washington, on Monday, the 13th of December, A. D. 1920, at 12 o'clock noon of that day, or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard, why the prayer of the said petition should not be granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Willis D. Williams et al., Plaintiffs in Error, 159 vs. The United States of America.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the defendant in error in support of the motion and by Mr. Milton A. Mangus for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

Louis Munder, Plaintiff in Error, 197 vs. The United States of America.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the defendant in error in support of the motion.

Central Union Trust Company, of New York, individually, etc., plaintiff in error, 392 vs. Francis P. Garvan, as Alien Property Custodian;

Edwin G. Merrill et al., etc., plaintiff in error, 393 vs.

Francis P. Garvan, as Alien Property
Custodian;

J. Markham Marshall, et al., Trustees, etc., plaintiffs in error,
394 vs.
Francis P. Garvan as Alien Property
Custodian.

J. Markham Marshall, et al., as Trustees, etc., plaintiffs in error,
395 vs.
Francis P. Garvan, as Alien Property
Custodian;
and
Metropolitan Trust Company of the City
of New York, Trustee, etc.,
plaintiff in error,
396 vs.
Francis P. Garvan, as Alien Property
Custodian.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the defendant in error.

United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, Plaintiff in Error,
440 vs.
Joseph M. Kinney.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson, of counsel, for the plaintiff in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
524 vs.
The Coronado Beach Company;

The United States of America,
Appellant,
525 vs.
Coronado Beach Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr.Solicitor General Frierson for the plaintiff in error and appellant.

Jules M. Arndstein, Appellant,
575 vs.
Thomas D. McCarthy, U. S. Marshal, etc.

The motion to recall mandate and for further proceedings herein was submitted by Mr. Charles Henry Butler in behalf of counsel.

John W. Davidge, Plaintiff in error
308 vs.
Leo Simmons.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted by Mr. Leo Simmons pro se, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Chapin Brown for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Giovanni Luzzato et al., etc.,
Appellants,
317 vs.
The Steamship "Pesaro", etc.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. G. M. Lanning in behalf of counsel for the appellee.

The Texas Company, Petitioner,
555 vs.
Hogarth Shipping Corporation, (Ltd) Owner, etc., et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. George M. Lanning in behalf of counsel for the respondent.

Charles L. Saunder, Appellant,
614 vs.
Frank Barnett, as Sheriff, etc.

The motion to advance and to admit to bail submitted by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler in behalf of the appellant.

Armour and Company, et al.,
Appellants,
149 vs.
The City of Dallas et al.

The suggestion of resignation of Pearl Wright and the appointment of J. L. Lancaster and Charles L. Wallace as his successors as Receivers of the Texas & Pacific Railway Company presented, and order substituting them as parties appellee entered on motion of Mr. George M. Lamar in behalf of counsel.

M. L. Ammerman et al.,
Petitioners,
516 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. W. C. Reeves in behalf of Mr. E. C. McAdams for the petitioners, with leave to counsel for the respondent to file brief on or before Monday next.

Ex parte In the Matter of Geromina Sanguinetti et al., --- Original Petitioners.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted by Mr. Benjamin Carter and Mr. Frank Carter Pope for the petitioners, and the motion denied.

Western Union Telegraph Company, Petitioner,
611 vs.
Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Alexander Pope Humphrey, Mr. Hush Taggart, Mr. Francis Raymond Stark, Mr. W. Overton Harris, Mr. Edward P. Humphrey and Mr. William M. Crawford for the petitioner and by Mr. Henry L. Stone and Mr. Edward S. Jouett for the respondent.

Producers Coke Company, Petitioner,
583 vs.
McKeefry Iron Company.

Petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Samuel John Morrow for the petitioner and by Mr. Samuel McClay and Mr. William M. Robinson for the respondent.

Fred Lasiter, Administrator, etc., Petitioner,
589 vs.
Walter Ferguson.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. C. Dale Wolfe and Mr. George C. Crump for the petitioner.

Arthur J. Dahn, petitioner,
605 vs.
Walker D. Hines, Director General of Railroads.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Walter C. Clephane and Mr. J. Wilmer Latimer for the petitioner.

Dallas Labor Temple Association et al., Appellants,
226 vs.
C. M. Cureton, Attorney General etc., et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Texas.

It appearing to the Court upon the report of the Clerk, that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record in this cause,

It is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

George Russell Hillet al., Appellants, vs. C. M. Cureton, Attorney General etc., et al. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Texas.

227

It appearing to the Court, upon the report of the Clerk, that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record in this cause,

It is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Galveston Artillery Club et al., Appellants, vs. C. M. Cureton, Attorney General., etc., et al. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Texas.

228

It appearing to the Court, upon the report of the Clerk that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record in this cause,

It is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, December 6th, next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, December 6th, 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day,

Willis VanDevanter,

Mahlon Pitney,

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

John H. Clarke,

Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Attorney General Palmer it is ordered that George E. Kelleher, Esquire, R. T. Scott, Esquire, and Lewis J. Daley, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and John Witherspoon Dodge, Esquire, of Jacksonville, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they word sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Peterson it is ordered that Charles H. Winter, Esquire, Harry B. Burke, Esquire, of Casper, and Nathan R. Greenfield, Esquire, of Rawlins, State of Wyoming, Robert ... Proctor, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, Linton J. Hopkins, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, Max Schoetz, Jr., Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, and Percy A. Matthews, Esquire of Hazlehurst, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George C. Hazleton, it is ordered that George E. Hart, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Rufus S. Day, it is ordered that Ellis H. Gidley, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of New York and Jesse B. Salmonson, Esquire of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank H. Hobokor, it is ordered that Russell G. Schulder, Esquire and Mark P. Braffet, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. H. Dudley it is ordered that H. H. Dudley, Esquire, of Jonesboro, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George C. Bedell, it is ordered that Eldon Bisbee, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Herman it is ordered that Bertin A. Weyl, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter W. Summers it is ordered thatW. J. Howard, Esquire, A. E. Amerman, Esquire, and E. N. Campbell, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert E. McNamara, it is ordered that Earl M. Seel, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, Harold S. Sharp, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, and Donald A. DeLashmutt, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Challen B. Ellis, it is ordered that Robert H. McKay, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. Duncan Bradley, it is ordered that Irving W. Cole, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of New York be admitted to practice as attoorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Seymour Stedman it is ordered that Henry P. Cochems, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. A. Harriman it is ordered that Jeremiah D. Wise, Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel Herrick it is ordered that William B. McFarland, Esquire, of Coeur d'Alene, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Needham it is ordered that Arthur Ponsford, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
vs.
Lehigh Valley Railroad Company
et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the District Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court with directions to enter a decree in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Specially concurring:

The Chief Justice,

Mr. Justice Holmes.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds and Mr. Justice Brandeis did not take part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

Monday, December 6th, continued.

Lewis M. Haupt, Appellant,
85 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.
The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Lewis M. Haupt, Appellant,
85 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to remand this cause to the Court of Claims for additional findings of fact, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Ana Maria Sugar Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
54 vs.
Tomas Quinones.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of Porto Rico.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The United States, Petitioner,
88 vs.
Northern Pacific Railway Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that this cause

be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Willie Nicosia, Plaintiff in Error,
74 vs.
The People of the State of New York.

In error to the County Court of Kings County, State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the County Court of Kings County, State of New York and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said County Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Albert J. Bothwell, and The Bothwell Company, Appellants,
78 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Joseph H. Sampliner,
Plaintiff in error,
89 vs.
Motion Picture Patents Company, Vitagraph Company of America, Biograph Company et al.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United

States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Great Western Serum Company,
Appellant,
90 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.
The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The Thames Towboat Company, Appeal from the District Court of the United
Appellant, States for the Southern District of New
97 vs. York.
The Schooner "Francis McDonald" her tackle, etc., Albert D. Cummings, Claimant.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Jin Fuey Moy, Plaintiff in Error, In error to the District Court of the United
44 vs. States for the Western District of Pennsyl-
The United States of America. vania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

per Mr. Justice Pitney.

Chicago, Milwaukee, & St. Paul Railway Company and Wabash Railway Company, Petitioners,

66 vs.

Des Moines Union Railway Company, F. M. Hubbell, et al.;

and

Des Moines Union Railway Company, F. M. Hubbell, et al., Petitioners,

67 vs.

Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company and Wabash Railway Company.

On writs of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, so far as adverse to petitioners in No. 66, be, and the same is hereby, reversed, except as to costs; so far as adverse to petitioners in No. 67, be, and the same is hereby affirmed; costs in both courts below to be divided between the parties as provided by the decrees of those courts; costs in this court to be paid by defendants Frederick M. Hubbell and Frederick C. Hubbell; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Iowa for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Pitney.

Wells Fargo & Company, Petitioner,

41 vs.

Oscar G. Taylor.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Mississippi for further proceed-

The United States, Appellant,

53 vs.

Nederlandsche-Amerikaansche Stoomvart Maatschappij (Holland America Lijn)

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims with directions to dismiss the petition.

per Mr. Justice Day.

The Berlin Mills Company, Petitioner,

93 vs.

Proctor & Gamble Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York with directions to dismiss the bill on the ground that claims 1 and 2 are void for the reasons stated in the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Day.

Henry S. DeRees, Appellant,

341 vs.

David Costaguta, Marcos A. Alriors, Alejandro Sassoli, Eugenio Ottolenghi, individually and as co-partners in business composing the co-partnership of David Costaguta & Company, Nemedo Taffoll and the

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Justice Day.

The Coca-Cola Company, Petitioner, vs. The Koke Company of America. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

101

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the District of Arizona in this cause be modified as indicated in the opinion of this Court, and, as so modified, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Ada C. Mongrain, Plaintiff in error, vs. W. H. Aaron, M. L. Levin, A. A. Smith, et.al. — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

61

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Louis Wunder, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America. 197 — In error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Maryland.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Maryland and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, vs. The State of Texas, Defendant, The United States of America, Intervenor. 23, Orig'l.

The receiver is hereby authorized and directed to make the following payments and to charge the same as expenses of the receivership: To Nagel & Kirby, the sum of seven thousand five hundred dollars as compensation for services heretofore rendered by them as counsel and attorneys for the receiver. To McKenney & Flannery the sum of fifteen thousand dollars on account of services rendered by them as counsel and attorneys for the receiver. And to Frederic A. Delano the sum of twenty-five thousand dollars on account of his services as receiver.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, vs. The State of Texas, Defendant, The United States of America. Intervenor. 23 Orig'l.

Upon consideration of the motion of the General Oil Company filed herein November 15, 1920, for an order authorizing Frederic A. Delano, Esq., Receiver herein, to return to said company certain lands claimed under patents from The State of Texas, and the consent of T. P. Roberts and H. S. Allen owners of patented lands, filed on the date last mentioned, and the response of the Receiver to said motion filed November 20, 1920,

It is ordered that said Receiver do return to said General Oil Company one certain well known by Receiver's number one hundred and seventy-six (176), which lies south of the south edge of the sand bed of the Red River as it was on the first day of April, 1920, (marked generally by the border line of vegetation along the edge of the flood plain), together with the land appurtenant thereto lying to the south of the south edge of the said bed of

river, and the structures, equipment, and material pertaining to said well, and the net proceeds of the production thereof that have come to the hands of said Receiver, less operating expenses and reservations, upan terms that said General Oil Company comply with the provisions contained in the order of this Court made June 7, 1920, respecting the return of certain lands lying south of the south edge of the sand bed of said river which were on the first day of April, 1920, in the possession of persons claiming under patents from the State of Texas, and not included in the river bed lands as in said order defined.

It is further ordered that except as herein above granted the motion of said General Oil Company for the return of lands, filed November 15, 1920, be, and it is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

O R D E R .

It is now here ordered by the Court that the Rules of Practice for the Courts of the United States in Admiralty and Maritime Jurisdiction, this day adopted and established by the Court, be, and the same are hereby, promulgated as such, to be in force on and after March 7th, 1921.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Central Union Trust Company of New York,
individually and as Trustee, etc.,
Plaintiff in error,
392 vs.
Francis P Garvan as Alien Property
Custodian;

Edwin G. Morrill, James Speyer, and
Frank A. Vanderlip, individually and
as Trustees, Plaintiffs in Error,
393 vs.
Francis P. Garvan, Alien Property
Custodian;
J. Markham Marshall, Walter T. Rosen
and Rudolph Metz, as Trustee, etc.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
394 vs.
Francis P. Garvan, as Alien Property
Custodian.

J. Markham Marshall, Walter T. Rosen
and Rudolph Metz, as Trustees, etc.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
395 vs.
Francis P. Garvan, as Alien Property
Custodian;
and
Metropolitan Trust Company of the City
of New York, Trustees, etc.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
396 vs.
Francis P. Garvan, as Alien Property
Custodian.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, January 3d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Charles L. Baender, Appellant,
614 vs.
Frank Barnett, as Sheriff of Alameda
County, California.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday January 3d, next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Charles L. Baender, Appellant,
614 vs.
Frank Barnett, as Sheriff of
Alameda County, California.

On consideration of the motion to admit appellant to bail pending the appeal in this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
524 vs.
The Coronado Beach Company,
and

The United States of America,
Appellant,
525 vs.
Coronado Beach Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, February, 28th next.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Giovanni Luzzato et al.,
Appellant,
317 vs.
The Steamship "Pesaro", etc.
and
Hogarth Shipping Corporation, Ltd.,
Owner of the Steamship "Baron Ogilvy", and Hugh Hogarth & Sons.

On consideration of the motions to advance these cases for argument with case No. 167, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

John W. Davidge,
Plaintiff in Error,
388 vs.
Leo Simmons.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Arthur J. Dahn, Petitioner,
605 vs.
Walker D. Hines, Director General of Railroads of the United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Producers ~~Coal &~~ Coke Company,
Petitioner,
583 vs.
McKeefry Iron Company.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and of the

argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Western Union Telegraph Company, Petitioner, vs. Louisville and Nashville Railroad Company. 611

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

R. L. Ammerman, J. O. Ammerman, Walter Sharp, and T. U. Salmon, Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 616

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petitionfor a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

David Lamar, et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The United States of America. 140

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson and Mr. Henry S. Mitchell for the defendants in error in support of the motion and by Mr. Elijah M. Zoline for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Theodore Kay. 162

In error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Wyoming.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr.

Solicitor General Frierson of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of the said motion, it is now hereordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The DeLamar Mining Company, Limited,
Plaintiff in Error,
179 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Nebeker, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Underwood for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Richard H. Johnson for the plaintiff in Error in opposition thereto.

Benjamin Harowitz, et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
232 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the defendant in error in support of the motion and by Mr. Elijah N. Zoline and Mr. John J. Fitzgerald for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

Chanslor-Canfield Midway Oil Company, et al., Appellants,
601 vs.
The United States of America.

The joint motion of Appellant Recovery Oil Company and appellee that this cause be remanded with instructions that the settlement of the case reached pursuant to the act of Congress of February 25, 1920, be carried into effect, submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the appellee.

The Merchant's Loan & Trust Company, Trustee, etc.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
608 vs.
Julius F. Smietanka, formerly U. S. Collector of Internal Revenue.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the defendant in error.

Eldorado Coal & Mining Company,
Plaintiff in error,
609 vs.
Harry W. Mager, Collector, etc.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the defendant in error.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, vs. The State of Texas. 23, Orig'l. — On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Frierson on behalf of the United States, Intervenor, leave is granted to file responses of the United States to applications of various parties for modification of order granting injunction and appointing receiver.

Truman A. Ketcham, Appellant, vs. Pleasant Valley Coal Company et al. 164 — The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted by Mr. William W. Kay for the appellee in support of the motion, and by Mr. E. A. Walton and Mr. Charles C. Dey for the appellant in opposition thereto.

The Supreme Tribe of Ben Hur, Appellant, vs. Aurelia J. Cauble et al. 274 — The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Merrill Moores in that behalf.

Anna Lang, as Administratrix, etc., Petitioner, vs. New York Central Railroad Company. 290 — The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Jennings C. Wise in that behalf.

Patrick H. Bodkin, Appellant, vs. William B. Edwards. 495 — The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted by Mr. Samuel Herrick for the appellee in support of the motion.

Ex parte In the Matter of D. H. Riddle, petitioner. ---- Original. — The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted by Mr. Benjamin Carter for the petitioner.

Rubio C. Connor et al., Petitioners, vs. Mona Kyle Elliott, etc. 446 — The motion to dismiss for the want of prosecution herein, was submitted by Mr. Benjamin Micou for the respondent in support of the motion.

Willard B. Bayne, Petitioner, vs. Helen F. Wentell, administratrix 402

The motion to dismiss for the want of prosecution herein was submitted by Mr. Charles W. Darr for the respondent in support of the motion.

The State of Georgia,
Complainant,
19, Original. vs.
The State of South Carolina.

On motion of Mr. Charles S. Douglas It is ordered that the time in which to file the report of the commissioner in this cause be, and it is hereby, extended.

National Brake & Electric Company,
Petitioner,
111 vs.
Neils A. Christianson et al.

On motion of Mr. W. W. Dodge in that behalf leave is granted to file brief of the General Electric Company as amicus curiae in this cause.

Jesse L. Waymire, Administratrix, etc.,
Petitioner,
579 vs.
The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company.

On motion of Mr. C. E. Brandenburg, it is ordered that the time within which to present a petition for a writ of certiorari herein, be, and it is extended for one week.

The People of the State of New York,
Complainants,
2, Original. vs.
The State of New Jersey et al.

Motion to set this cause for reargument was submitted by Mr. R. L. Barbox for the complainants.

The Baldwin Company et al.,
Petitioners,
113 vs.
H. S. Howard Company.
and
The Baldwin Company et al.,
Appellants,
139 vs.
H. S. Howard Company.

The motion to dismiss in these cases was submitted by Mr. Samuel Watson for the respondent and appellee in support of the motion and by Mr. John E. Cross for the petitioners and appellants in opposition thereto.

Mohawk Oil Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
606 vs.
Mrs. Zula McFadin Layne, etc.
for the respondent.

The petition for writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. E. P. Hall and Mr. J. D. Wilkinson for the petitioners and by Mr. E. L. Herrold

Monday, December 6th, 1920, continued.

Herbert L. Hildreth, petitioner,
333 vs.
Jim M. Mastoras.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Joseph L. Atkins for the respondent.

Lambert Run Coal Company,
Appellant,
585 vs.
The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Rush C. Butler Mr. John A. Howard and Mr. Frank E. Harkness for the appellant in support of the petition.

The Federal Mining and Smelting Company, Petitioner,
598 vs.
Star Mining Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. John A. Marshall and Mr. Frederick W. Lehmann for the petitioner, and by Mr. John P. Gray and Mr. James A. Wayne for the respondent.

Oregon-Washington Railroad & Navigation Company, Petitioner,
617 vs.
J. B. McGinn.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. A. C. Spencer, Mr. C. E. Cochran and Mr. John F. Reilly for the petitioner, and by Mr. H. L. Edmiston for the respondent.

William R. Castle, et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
629 vs.
Julia White Castle.

The petition for a writ of certioraro herein was submitted by Mr.A. C. Robertson for the petitioners.

Ng Fung Ho, otherwise known as Ung Kip et al., Petitioners,
635 vs.
Edward White as Commissioner of Immigration of the Port of San Francisco.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr.Jackson H. Ralston and Mr. George W. Hott for the petitioners.

Clark County National Bank,
Plaintiff in Error,
350 vs.
The Commonwealth of Kentucky.

In error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and

adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Port of Seattle, Appellant,
107 vs.
Oregon & Washington Railroad Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Leander T. Turner for the appellant and by Mr. W. H. Bogle for the appellees.

W. S. Bullock, Judge, etc., et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
262 vs.
The State of Florida ex rel The Railroad Commissioners of Florida.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Gerogo C. Bedell for the plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Tuesday, December 7th, 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day,

Willis VanDevanter,

Mahlon Pitney,

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

John H. Clarke,

Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court inthis behalf by Mr. W. W. Bride, it is ordered that Erle M. Leaf, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. H. Liggett it is ordered that Abraham Kamberg, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry A. Hegarty it is ordered that Scott H. Lilly, Esquire, of Takoma Park, State of Maryland, and Frank D. Gray, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Smith, it is ordered that Ira S. Lillick, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence F. Lee, it is ordered that A. E. Cooley, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. C. Herron, it is ordered that John A. Poland, Esquire, Chillicothe, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wesley L. Jones, it is ordered that Guy E. Kelly, Esquire, of Tacoma, State of Washington be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

W. S. Bullock, Judge, etc., et al., Plaintiffs in error,
262 vs.
The State of Florida ex rel The Railroad Commissioners of the State of Florida.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. George C. Bedell for the plaintiffs in error, by Mr. Dozier A. DeVane for the defendant in error and concluded by Mr. George C. Bedell for the plaintiffs in error.

Grant Smith-Porter Ship Company,
304 vs.
Herman P. Rhode.

This cause was argued by Mr. Charles A. Hart for the Ship Company and by Mr. Harry A. Hegarty for Rhode.

Alexander Kahn et al., Appellants,
421 vs.
August V. Anderson, Warden, etc.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Martin J. O'Donnell for the Appellants and continued by Mr. W. C. Herron for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, December 8th, 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis VanDevanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke.
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson it is ordered that J. Joseph Lilly, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. D. A. Frank, it is ordered that Joseph D. Frank, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hatton W. Summers it is ordered that Harry P. Jordan, Esquire, of Waco, and Thomas T. Connally, Esquire, of Marlin, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by E. M. Hewlett it is ordered that Richard L. Baltimore, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Porter J. McCumber and W. F. Burnett, Esquire, it is ordered that L. R. Baird, Esquire, of Dickinson, State of North Dakota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Alexander Kahn, et al., Appellants,

Augustus V. Anderson, Warden, etc. The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Martin J. O'Donnell, for the appellants.

Eugene Sol Louie, Petitioner,
337 vs.
The United States of America.
Respondent.

This cause was argued by Mr. William B. McFarland for the petitioner and by Mr. William C. Herron for the respondent.

Director General of Railroads
et al.,
424 vs.
The Viscose Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Henry Wolf Bickle and Mr. Theodore W. Heath for the carriers and by Mr. Harold S. Shertz for the Viscose Company.

J. W. Goldsmith, Jr-Grant Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
214 vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was argued by Mr. L. C. Hopkins for the plaintiff in error and by Mrs. Assistant Attorney General Adams for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court in adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Thursday, December 9th, 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice

Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis VanDevanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Martin J. O'Donnell it is ordered that Dell D. Dutton, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. B. Durham, it is ordered that William C. Wilson, Esquire, of Casper, State of Wyoming be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. M. P. Kinkaid it is ordered that J. M. Fitzgerald, Esquire, of Kearney, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John P. Wilson it is ordered that John S. Miller, Jr., Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fred C. Geiger it is ordered that Henry M. Fowler, Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Atlee Pomerene it is ordered that Francis B. Kavanagh, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Watson it is ordered that Ralph Emory, Esquire, of Toledo, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. E. Blackburn, it is ordered that Von L. Thompson, Esquire of Birmingham, State of Alabama be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry E. Barbour it is ordered that Olen Lee Everts, Esquire, of Fresno, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Isidore S. Workin et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
115 vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lawrence B. Cohen and Mr. I. Maurice Wormser for the plaintiffs in error and by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson, for the defendant in error.

St. Louis & San Francisco Railway Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
117 vs.
The Public Service Commission of the State of Missouri.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William F. Evans and Mr. Edward T. Miller for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. James D. Lindsay for the defendant in error.

The United States of America,
plaintiff in error,
206 vs.
James H. Strang et al.

The United States, Appellant,
442. vs.
Stanley Field, as Executor, etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. John W. Dodge for the defendants in error.

Thursday, December 9th, 1920, continued.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Davis and Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the appellant and by Mr. John P. Wilson for the appellee.

Victor L. Berger, et al.,
460 vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was argued by Mr. Seymour Stedman and Mr. Henry F. Cochems for Berger et al., and by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the United States of America.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Friday, December 10th, 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day,

Willis VanDevanter, Associate Justices.

Mahlon Pitney

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

John H. Clarke

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leslie C. Garnett, it is ordered that Jesse C. Duke, Esquire, of Richmond, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

George C. LaMotte, et al., Appellants,
121 vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was submitted by Mr. T. J. Leahy and Mr. Charles S. Macdonald for the appellants and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Nebeker and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Underwood for the appellee.

The Yazoo and Mississippi Valley Railroad Company et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
122 vs.
The City of Clarksdale.

This cause was passed pursuant to the 26th Rule on motion of Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, in behalf of counsel.

Bartholomew Sullivan et al.,
Appellants,
65 vs.
Jane Midd.

This cause was argued by Mr. H. M. Langworthy for the appellee and submitted by Mr. George P. Beatty and Mr. B. I. Litowich for the appellants, and by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the United States, by special leave of Court.

Friday, December 10th, 1920, continued.

National Brake and Electric Company, Petitioner,
111 vs.
Neils A. Christensen et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. John S. Miller for the petitionbr and by Mr. and Mr. Louis Quarles Joseph B. Cotton for the respondents.

Michael F. Magan, Administrator, etc., Appellants,
112 vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. Charles F. Consaul for the appellant and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Davis for the appellee.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, December 13th, 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:-

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis VanDevanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,

Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshall,

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court in opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Irving W. Cole it is ordered that Thomas P. Haley, Esquire of Buffalo, State of New York be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James McLaughlin it is ordered that Earl C. Michener, Esquire of Adrian and Clare Retan, Esquire of Lansing, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Stephen G. Porter it is ordered that Abraham H. Kaufman, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Guy Mason it is ordered that Paul Demos, Esquire of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Merrill Moores it is ordered that John J. Babka, Esquire of Cleveland, State of Ohio, and Charles R. Metzger, Esquire of Indianapolis, State of Indiana be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. H. Carrigan

it is ordered that Leslie Humphrey, Esquire, of Wichita Falls, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Jacob Rogers it is ordered that Lyman R. Clark, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson, it is ordered that George M. O'Connell, Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler it is ordered that Karl W. Kindleberger, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. P. Freeling, it is ordered that William H. Swick, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Galveston, Harrisburg & San Antonio, Railway Company, Petitioner, 100 vs. L. H. Woodbury and Vincent Woodbury.	On writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Eighth Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Civil Appeals for the Eighth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Civil Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Civil Appeals for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

William L. Walls, Attorney General of The State of Wyoming, Frank A. Little, Prosecuting Attorney of Big Horn County, and Robert D. Carey, Governor of the State of Wyoming, Appellants,

219 vs.

Midland Carbon Company and Occidental Oil and Gas Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Wyoming.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Wyoming and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity to the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Dissenting:

The Chief Justice,
Mr. Justice VanDevanter,
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Joseph Gilbert, Plaintiff in error,

79 vs.

The State of Minnesota.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Mr. Justice Holmes concurs in the result.
The Chief Justice dissents.
Mr. Justice Brandeis also dissents.

The United State of America on the relation of Verdine R. Hall,

Plaintiff in error,

95 vs.

John Barton Payne, Secretary of the Interior. — In error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

John Valleley, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Northern Fire & Marine Insurance Company, — On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

96 vs.

Northern Fire and Marine Insurance Company.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the first and second questions certified must be answered in the affirmative, and that the third question certified must be answered in the negative.

Whereupon, it is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in error, — In error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Arizona.

68 vs.

Harry C. Wheeler, George B. Wilcox, Walter Douglas, et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Arizona, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Dissenting:

Isidore S. Workin and Henry V. Myers, Plaintiffs in Error,
115. vs.
The United States of America.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

David Lamar and Henry B. Martin, Plaintiffs in Error,
140 vs.
The United States of America.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Truman A. Ketchum, Appellant,
164 vs.
Pleasant Valley Coal Company and Guaranty Trust Company.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Benjamin Horowitz and Hyman Horowitz, Plaintiffs in error,
232 vs.
The United States of America.

Monday, December 13th, 1920, continued.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte In the matter of D. H. Riddle, Petitioner, --- Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte In the matter of D. H. Riddle, Petitioner, --- Original.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that cause be shown by Honorable W. I. Grubb, United States District Judge for the Northern District of Alabama, and the United States District Court for the Northern District of Alabama, Eastern Division, before this Court, at the City of Washington, on Monday, January 10th, next, or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard, why the prayer of said petition should not be granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Victor Hoffman, Appellant, 580 vs. Francis P. Garvan, Alien Property Custodian, et al.

On consideration of the application for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Chanslor-Canfield Midway Oil Company, Recovery Oil Company, et al., Appellants, 601 vs. The United States of America.

On consideration of the joint motion of Recovery Oil Company, one of the appellants and the United States of America, that this cause, in so far as it concerns said Recovery Oil Company, be remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California to carry into effect the settlement of the case reached by the above named parties pursuant to Act of Congress of February 15, 1920.

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The People of the State of New York, Complainant,
2, Original. vs.
The State of New Jersey et al.

On consideration of the motion to fix a day for the further argument of this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday January 24th, next.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Supreme Tribe of Ben Hur,
Appellant,
274 vs.
Aurelia J. Cauble et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied, but the cause will be taken on submission on printed briefs if counsel are so advised.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Anna Lang, as Administratrix, etc., Petitioner,
290 vs.
New York Central Railroad Company.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be placed on the summary docket.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Herbert L. Hildreth, Petitioner,
333 vs.
Jim M. Mastoras.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Merchants' Loan & Trust Company, Trustee, etc., Plaintiff in Error,
608 vs.
Julius F. Smietanka, formerly U. S. Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

Eldorado Coal & Mining Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
609 vs.
Harry W. Mager, Collector, etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, January 3d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Baldwin Company,
Petitioner,
113 vs.
H. S. Howard Company.
The Baldwin Company et al.,
Petitioner,
139 vs.
H. S. Howard Company.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in these cases be postponed until the hearing of the cases on the merits.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The DeLamar ~~Bond~~ Company,
Limited, Plaintiff in error,
179 vs.
The United States of America.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Willard B. Bryne, Petitioner,
402 vs.
Helen F. Martell, Administratrix, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Superior Court of the State of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the motion to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari herein for want of prosecution, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of prosecution.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Rubie C. Connor and her husband,
Claude E. Connor et al.,
446 Petitioners,
Nena Kyle Elliott, as Executrix,
etc.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

On consideration of the motion to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari herein for want of prosecution, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of prosecution.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Oregon-Washington Railroad & Navigation Company, Petitioner, vs. J. B. McGinn. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

517

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

William H. Castle et al., Trustees, etc., Petitioners, vs. Julia White Castle. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

529

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Mg Fung Ho, otherwise known as Ung Kip et al., Petitioners, vs. Edward White, as Commissioner of Immigration for the Port of San Francisco. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

635

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Fred Lassiter, Administrator, etc., Petitioner,

589 vs. Walter Ferguson. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Lambert Run Coal Company, Appellant, 585 vs. The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company. On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Federal Mining & Smelting Company, Petitioner, 598 vs. Star Mining Company. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Mohawk Oil Company, et al., Petitioners, 606 Mrs. Eula McWadin Layne, Sole heir, etc. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Chief Justice announced that the Court will take a recess from Monday, the 20th instant to Monday, January 3d, 1921.

LaBelle Iron Works, Appellant,

The United States of America. On motion of Mr. William L. Frierson in that behalf, leave is granted to Mr. Frank Hagerman to file brief as amicus curiae is this cause.

New Orleans Dry Dock & Ship Building Company, plaintiff in error, 301 vs. John A. S. Gray. The motion to dismiss this cause was submitted by Mr. Percy S. Benedict for the defendant in error in support of the motion and by Mr. F. D. McKenney and Mr. John S. Flannery for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Adelbert L. Spitzer, et al., etc., Petitioners, 637 vs. The Board of Trustees for the Regina Public School District No. 4. etc. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Thomas H. Tracy and Mr. George D. Welles for the petitioners.

Jessie L. Raymire, Administratrix, etc., Petitioner, 579 vs. The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. E. C. Brandenburg and Mr. Charles W. Steiger for the petitioner.

John Hedenskoy, Petitioner, 626 vs. Alaska Packers Association. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Jackson H. Ralston and Mr. H. W. Hutton for the petitioner.

Solomon Rothman et al., Petitioners, 634 vs. The United States. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Louis Marshall for the petitioners, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. W. C. Herron for the respondent.

Henry Briggs, petitioner, 642 vs. The United Shoe Machinery Corporation. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. William A. Millikan for the petitioner and by Mr. Robert M. Mederter and Mr. Walter Bates Farr for the respondent.

Monday, December 13th, 1920, continued.

W. H. Casey et al., Petitioners,
615 vs.
A. Eikland et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Frank P. Deering and Mr. George B. Grigsby for the petitioners.

Perfection Disappearing Bed Company, Inc., et al., Petitioners,
621. vs.
Murphy Wall Bed Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Herman H. Phleger for the petitioners and by Mr. William H. White for the respondents.

L. W. Boehner, Petitioner,
639 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. William H. Green for the petitioner, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Edward C. Ward,
Plaintiff in error,
126 vs.
The State of Washington et al.

This cause was passed per stipulation of counsel pursuant to the 26th Rule.

Morris Zucker, Plaintiff in Error,
127 vs.
The United States of America.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York and the plaintiff in error having been three times solemnly called by the Marshal to come into Court and prosecute his writ of error, and failing to appear it is, thereupon, in pursuance of the 16th Rule of this Court, and on the motion of Mr. Solicitor General Frierson, of counsel for the defendant in error, now [illegible] and adjudged by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Heirs of Samuel Garland, deceased, Appellants,
129 vs.
The Choctaw Nation.

This cause was passed per stipulation of counsel pursuant to the 26th Rule.

Lawrence Amos, plaintiff in error,
114 vs.

This cause was argued by Mr. H. H. Obear for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. W. C. Herron for the defendant in error.

Ex parte In the Matter of
Chicago, Rock Island and
Pacific Railway Company.
24, Orig'l. Petitioner.

This cause was argued on the return to the rule to show cause by Mr. Lawrence Maxwell and Mr. William L. Day for the petitioner and by Mr. George D. Welles and Mr. Thurlow M. Gordon in opposition to the petition.

Ex parte In the Matter of
the State of New York et al.,
25, Orig'l. Petitioners.

The argument on the return of the Rule to show cause herein was commenced by Mr. Edward G. Griffin for the petitioners.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Tuesday, December 14th, 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis VanDevanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke.
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire Marshal.

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Park it is ordered that Edgar E. Pomeroy, Esquire and Paul S. Etheridge, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, and J. H. Smithwick, Esquire, of Pensacola, State of Florida be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

Edward S. Atwater, Petitioner,
511 vs.
Stephen G. Guernsey, et al., etc.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court pursuant to the 20th Rule by Mr. Abram J. Rose for the petitioner and by Mr. R. Dulany Whiting for the respondent.

Ex parte In the Matter of the People of the State of New York et al., Petitioners,
25, Orig'l.

The argument on the return to the rule to show cause herein was continued by Mr. Edward G. Griffin for the petitioners by Mr. Billis H. Gidley in opposition to the petition and concluded by Mr. Edward G. Griffin for the petitioners.

Ex parte In the Matter of the State of New York et al., Owners of the Steam Tug "Queen City", Petitioners,
26, Orig'l.

This cause was argued on the return to the rule to show cause by Mr. Edward G. Griffin for the petitioners and by Mr. Irving M. Cole in opposition to the petition.

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
23 Orig'l. vs.

The State of Texas.

On motion of Mr. Joseph W. Bailey in that behalf, one hour additional time was allowed counsel for the landowners for oral argument.

On motion of Mr. Assistant Attorney General Garnett in that behalf, four hours were allowed other counsel for the argument of this cause.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Garnett for the United States of America, Intervenor, and continued by Mr. C. M. Cureton for the defendant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, December 15th, 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:-

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson it is ordered that Edward E. Corn, Esquire, of Ironton, State of Ohio and Samuel C. Schlein, Esquire, of New Haven, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. [illegible] Hewitt-tor it is ordered that Kent V. Gray, Esquire, of McAlester, State of Oklahoma be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. [illegible], it is ordered that John L. Taugher, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. [illegible] McKenney, it is ordered that D. P. Williams, Esquire, of [illegible], State of Pennsylvania be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. [illegible] Gregory, it is ordered that Charles H. Weston, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander Britton, it is ordered that A. S. H. Bristow, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, it is ordered that Thomas H. Gall, Esquire, of Duluth, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. W. Jefferis it is ordered that John W. Cooper, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Sutherland it is ordered that H. A. Rich, Esquire, and Logan Morris, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl Chindblom, it is ordered that John J. Kelly, Esquire and Daniel M. Dever, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
23 Original. vs.
The State of Texas.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. C. M. Cureton, and Mr. Thomas W. Gregory for the defendant, by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey and Mr. A. H. Carrigan for the landowners, by special leave of Court, and concluded by Mr. S. P. Freeling for the complainant.

Alexander Smith Cochran,
et al., etc., Appellants,
116 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. H. T. Newcomb for the appellants.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Thursday, December 16th, 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:-

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day,

Willis Van Devanter,

Mahlon Pitney,

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

John H. Clarke,

Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Selden P. Spencer, it is ordered that Forrest C. Donnell, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph Fairbanks, it is ordered that Miller D. Steever, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leslie C. Garnett, it is ordered that Arthur D. Bouton, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert E. Evans, it is ordered that Otto M. Wasek, Esquire, of West Point, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fritz G. Lanham, it is ordered that Harold P. Stearns, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America,
1 vs. Appellant,
Lehigh Valley Railroad Company
et al.
for the appellant.

The motion to amend the decree in this cause was submitted by Mr. Edgar H. Boles for the appellees; and consented to by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson

Alexander Smith Cochran, et al.,
etc., Appellants,
116 vs.
The United States.
Newcomb for the appellants/

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. H. T. Newcomb for the appellants, by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the appellee and concluded by Mr. H. T.

A. L. Bracht, petitioner,
118 vs.
San Antonio & Aransas Pass
Railway Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Samuel Herrick for the respondent and submitted by Mr. I. N. Watson for the petitioner.

John Barton Payne, Secretary of
the Interior et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
123. vs.
The United States ex rel Allen L.
Newton.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Garnett for the plaintiffs in error and by Mr. Francis W. Clements for the defendant in error.

Vandalia Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in error,
125 vs.
Gustav A. Schnull et al., etc.
et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. D. P. Williams for the plaintiff in error and continued by Mr. Karl K. Gardner for the defendants in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Friday, December 17th, 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day,

Willis VanDevanter,

Mahlon Pitney,

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

John H. Clarke,

Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, it is ordered that Joseph H. Ford, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence H. Goodwin, it is ordered that Otto Christensen, Esquire of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hoke Smith, it is ordered that Howard Herron, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California and Virgil E. Adams, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practise as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. J. Walsh, it is ordered that Margaret Young, and H. C. Young, Esquire, of Forsyth, State of Montana be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

Vandalia Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in error,
125 vs.
Gustav A. Schmull et al., etc.

The argument of this cause was concluded by by Karl K. Gartner for the defendants in error. Leave granted to counsel for both sides to file supplemental briefs within two weeks.

Economy Light and Power Company,

104 vs.

The United States of America.

Clarence N. Goodwin, for the appellee.

This cause was argued by Mr. Frank H. Scott for the appellant, and by Mr.

E. Hilton Jackson, receiver, etc., petitioner,

130. vs.

John Lewis Smith.

This cause was argued by Mr. W. W. Millan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Louis A. Dent for the respondents.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, December 20th, 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:-

Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day,

Willis Van Devanter,

Mahlon Pitney,

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

John H. Clarke,

Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson it is ordered that Fred N. Angevine, Esquire, of Missoula, State of Montana; Ruling P. Robertson, Jr., Esquire, of Temple, State of Texas; Charles Rogers Arundell, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon; Rayford W. Alley, Esquire, of New York City; Charles L. Smith, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts; Foye M. Murphy, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts; Will R. Gregg, Esquire, of Palestine, State of Texas; Ray P. Bruce, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois; Chester A. Gwinn, Esquire, of Alexandria, State of Virginia; Luther S. Cannon, Esquire, of Lenoir, State of North Carolina; Lyndon H. Baylies, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia; John D. Foley, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia; Herbert N. Maute, Esquire, of Toledo, State of Ohio; Mills Litchfield, Esquire, of Scotland Neck, State of North Carolina; Jacob M. Charest, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland; Frank S. Angell, Esquire, of New York City; Manton M. Tyrell, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia; Carl S. Matz, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois; Douglas D. Felix, Esquire, of Hartford, State of Kentucky; W. Hall Twigg, Esquire, of Bonneville, State of Missouri; were admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

R. Harvin of Manning, Esq., State of South Carolina, B Louisiana

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Rush C. Butler it is ordered that Fletcher Lewis, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Bynum E. Hinton it is ordered that Julian C. Hammack, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Spalding Flannery, it is ordered that Horace F. Baker, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank W. McAllister it is ordered that J. W. Broaddus, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas Stirling it is ordered that Walter M. Chocver, Esquire, of Brookings, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

H. Snowden Marshall, as Receiver of All Package Grocery Stores Company, Petitioner,

294 vs.

The People of the State of New York.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Jules S. Arnstein, Appellant,

575 vs.

Thomas D. McCarthy, U. S. Marshal for the Southern District of New York.

On consideration of the motion on behalf of Henry A. Gildersleeve, Trustee in Bankruptcy, for leave to intervene herein, to permit a re-argument of this appeal, to direct that the entire

all proceedings in respect thereto, and to grant further and proper relief, on of the argument of counsel in support of the same,

It is now here ordered by the Court that [illegible] be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company,
Plaintiff in error,
15 vs.
The C. L. Merrick Company.

In error to the District Court of the Sixth Judicial District of the State of North Dakota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the Sixth Judicial District of the State of North Dakota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Justice VanDevanter.

Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste Marie Railway Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
55 vs.
Washburn Lignite Coal Company.

In error to the District Court Sixth Judicial District, State of North Dakota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court, Sixth Judicial District, State of North Dakota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Frank C. Thornton and The Cleveland Stamping and Tool Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
76 vs.
Thomas J. Duffy, and Herbery L. Eliot, Members of and ~~Members~~ Composing the Industrial Commission of

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Specially concurring:

Mr. Chief Justice White.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The United States of America, Appellant,
1 vs.
Lehigh Valley Railroad Company et al.

On consideration of the motion to modify the decree of this Court in this case, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

LaBelle Iron Works, Appellant,
453 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion of counsel for National Lumber Manufacturers' Association for leave to file brief herein as amicus curiae, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted. It is further ordered that the motion for leave to participate in the oral argument be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Jessie L. Waymire, Administratrix, etc., Petitioner,
579 vs.
The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

W. W. Casey et al., Petitioners, vs. A. Eikland et al.
615
On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Perfection Disappearing Bed Company, Inc., et al., Petitioners, vs. Murphy Wall Bed Company et al.
681.
On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

John Hedenskoy, Petitioner, vs. Alaska Packers Association.
626
On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Solomon Rothman et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America.
634
On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is

Adelbert L. Spitzer et al., as Spitzer-Rorick & Company,
Petitioners,
637 vs.
The Board of Trustees for the Regina Public School District No. 4 of Saskatchewan.

On petition for writ ofcertiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari here in to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now hereorderd by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

L. W. Boehmer, Petitioner,
639 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it isnow here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Henry Briggs, Petitioner,
642 vs.
United Shoe Machinery Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of asagainst the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Julius Block, etc.,
Plaintiff in error,
640 vs.
Louis Hirsh.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Frierson leave is granted to file brief as amicus curiae in this cause.

Julius Block, etc.,

340 vs. Louis Hirsh.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Jesse C. Adkins for the plaintiff in error.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
23 Original. vs.
The State of Texas, Defendant,
The United States of America, Intervenor.

The petition of the Oklahoma Petroleum & Gasoline Company to require receiver herein to file full and complete itemized statement of expenses incurred from May 15th to July 1st, 1920, showing expenses of operating certain wells and to pay over certain sums of money; motion of C. J. Benson et al., that receiver be required to file certain inventory as to property and to pay value thereof, etc.; and motion of Sinclair Oil & Gas Company to require receiver to refund certain proceeds of the sale of oil, and that said Oil and Gas Company be relieved of payment of any of the expenses and cost of receivership submitted by Mr. W. A. Ledbetter in support of the same, with leave to J. S. Flannery, counsel for the receiver, to file opposition thereto within 10 days.

LaBelle Iron Works, Appellant,
483 vs.
The United States.

On motion of Mr. Guy Mason, leave is granted to file brief as amicus curiae in this cause on behalf of the Long-Bell Lumber Company.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company, Appellant,
636 vs.
George H. Middlekamp, State Treasurer of the State of Missouri, et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. W. McAllister for the appellees.

Bank of Minden et al., Plaintiffs in error,
238 vs.
Mrs. Louie Clement, administratrix.

The motion to dismiss submitted by Mr. Bynum E. Hinton in behalf of defendant in error in support of the motion.

Benjamin F. Dorrance et al., Petitioners,
330 vs.
Charles Francis Dorrance.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. William A. Glasgow Jr., and Mr. William J. Hughes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Kenneth McC. Dawsson and Mr. Charles A. Houts for the respondent.

Emma F. Rumsey, Petitioner,
625 vs.
New York Life Insurance Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. T. J. O'Donnell for the petitioner.

William Hollis et al., Appellants,
397 vs.
Charles W. Kutz et al., Commissioners etc., et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Roscoe F. Walter for the appellant.

The United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
612 vs.
Travelers Insurance Machine Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. William Marshall Bullitt for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition and by Mr. David R. Castleman for the respondent in opposition thereto.

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company,
Petitioner,
623 vs.
Lee Vandiver.

Petition for writ of certiorari herein submitted by Mr. Hollins N. Randolph for the petitioner and by Mr. Virgil E. Adams for the respondent.

Boston, Cape Cod and New York Canal Company,
Petitioner,
628 vs.
C. W. Chadwick & Company.

The petition for writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Thomas H. Mahoney for the petitioner and by Mr. Edward E. Blodgett for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, January 3d, 1921, at 12 o'clock.

Monday, January 3d, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day,

Willis Van Devanter,

Mahlon Pitney,

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

John H. Clarke,

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson it is ordered that Frank C. Dailey, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana; George L. Ingraham, Esquire, of New York City, and Asa J. Smith, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. [illegible], it is ordered that I. C. Pinkney, Esquire, of Peoria, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Stephen A. Foster, it is ordered that Karl D. Loos, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Newton D. Baker, it is ordered that Benjamin F. Firey, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Levi Cooke it is ordered that Charles I. Dawson, Esquire, of Frankfort, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Hughes it is ordered that Allen B. Hubbard, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. M. Stroock, it is ordered that Ralph Wolf, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. A. Hegarty it is ordered that Mark Stearrman, Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in thisbehalf by Mr. Frank S. Bright it is ordered that Charles Stephens, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Kansas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Michael F. Mangan, Administrator of Mary E. Pillow, deceased, Appellant,
112 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel,

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

The Director General of Railroads et al.,
424 vs.
The Viscose Company.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the question certified must be answered in the negative,

Whereupon it is now here ordered by this Court that it be so cer-

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice McKenna,
Mr. Justice VanDevanter,
Mr. Justice Pitney,
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

A. L. Bracht, Petitioner,
118 vs.
San Antonio and Aransas Pass
Railway Company.

On writ of certiorari to the Kansas City Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Kansas City Court of Appeals for the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Kansas City Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
206 vs.
James H. Strang, Henry C. Thomas,
and Leroy W. Walter.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds,

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Clarke.

Duplex Printing Press Company,
Appellant,
45 vs.
Emil J. Deering and William Bramley,
individually and as business agents

tional Association of Machinists, et al. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs in this court and in both courts below; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Pitney,

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Brandeis,
Mr. Justice Holmes,
Mr. Justice Clarke.

National Brake and Electric Company, Petitioner,
111 vs.
Niels A. Christensen and Allis-Chalmers Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings upon the petition filed by the National Brake & Electric Company in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Day.

Bartholomew Sullivan, Margaret Tholen, John Martin et al., Appellants,
65 vs.
Jane Kidd.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Day.

Erie Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Board of Public Utility Commissioners, City of Paterson et al. — In error to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

33

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Errors and Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:

The Chief Justice,
Mr. Justice VanDevanter,
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Erie Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Board of Public Utility Commissioners City of Paterson et al. — In Error to the Court of Errors and Appeals for the State of New Jersey.

34

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this

Court that the judgment of the said Court of Errors and Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:

The Chief Justice.
Mr. Justice Van Devanter,
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Passaic Water Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
35 vs.
Board of Public Utility Commissioners, City of Paterson et al.,

In error to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Errors and Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:

The Chief Justice.
Mr. Justice Van Devanter,
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Western Union Telegraph Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
36 vs.
Board of Public Utility Commissioners City of Paterson et al.

In error to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of errors and appeals of the State of New Jersey and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Errors and Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:

The Chief Justice

Mr. Justice Van Devanter,
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

D. Fullerton & Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Board of Public Utility Commissioners, City of Paterson et al. — In error to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

37

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Errors and Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:

The Chief Justice,
Mr. Justice Van Devanter,
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Jacob Meyer et al., etc., Plaintiffs in error, vs. Board of Public Utility Commissioners, City of Paterson et al. — In error to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

38

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey and was argued by Counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Errors and Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:

The Chief Justice
Mr. Justice Van Devanter,
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Morris and Company,

Plaintiff in Error,

Board of Public Utility Commissioners, City of Paterson, et al. — In error to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of errors and appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:

The Chief Justice,
Mr. Justice VanDevanter,
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Public Service Railway Company, Plaintiff in error, vs. Board of Public Utility Commissioners, City of Paterson, et al. — In error to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

40

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this court that the judgment of the said Court of Errors and Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:

The Chief Justice.
Mr. Justice Van Devanter,
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Southern Pacific Company, Petitioner, vs. W. S. Berkshire, Temporary Administrator and Personal Representative of the Estate of William A. Linder, deceased. — On writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Eighth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

106

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Civil Appeals for the Eighth Supreme Judicial District of the State

of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Civil Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Civil Appeals for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Clarke,
Mr. Justice Day,
Mr. Justice Pitney.

511 Edward S. Atwater, Petitioner, vs. Stephen G. Guernsey, Samuel H. Brown and Charles A. Hopkins, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Morton Atwater, et al., etc.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

116. Alexander Smith Cochran and William F. Cochran, as Surviving Executors of the Last Will and Testament of William P. Cochran, deceased, Appellants, vs. The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in

the same is hereby, affirmed.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

New Orleans Dry Dock and Ship Building Company, Plaintiff in Error,
301 vs.
John A. C. Gray.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

William Hollis and Sam Goodman, Appellants,
397 vs.
Charles W. Kutz, Chairman, Louis Brownlow and W. Gwynn Gardiner, Commissioners of the District of Columbia etc., et al.
assigned for that day,

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 28th next, after the cases heretofore

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company, Appellant,
336 vs.
George H. Middlekamp, State Treasurer of the State of Missouri, and Frank W. McAllister Attorney General of the State of Missouri.
assigned for that day.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 28th next, after the cases heretofore

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Julius Block, trading and carrying on business under the name and style of Whites, Plaintiff in error,
640 vs.

Louis Hirsh.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted and that the cause be assigned for argument on Monday, February 28th next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Bank of Minden et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
238 vs.
Mrs. Louis Clement, Administratrix, etc.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company and Maryland Casualty Company,
Plaintiffs in error,
612 vs.
Travelers Insurance Machine Co.

On consideration of the petition for writ of certiorari herein and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Missouri Air Line Railway Company, Petitioner,
623 vs.
Lee Vandiver.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kansas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Emma F. Ramsey, Petitioner,
625 vs.
New York Life Insurance Company and Benson, Smith & Company, Ltd.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Boston, Hoosac Tool & New York Canal Company, Petitioner, vs. C. W. Chadwick & Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

628

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Benjamin F. Dorrance, J. Ford Dorrance and Dorrance Reynolds, Petitioners, vs. Charles Francis Dorrance. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

630

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

LaBelle Iron Works, Appellant, vs. The United States. — The motion for leave to make oral argument in this cause was submitted by Mr. George T. Weitzel for Mr. Clarence H. Goodwin, and

453

the motion denied.

LaBelle Iron Works, Appellant, vs. The United States. — On motion of Mr. L. P. Marvin, in that behalf, leave is granted to file brief as amicus curiae in this cause.

453

LaBelle Iron Works, Appellant, vs. The United States. — On motion of Mr. E. S. Brashears in that behalf, leave is granted to file brief as amicus curiae in this cause.

453

The State of Georgia, Complainant,

19, Original. vs. The State of South Carolina. — On motion of Mr. Hugh H. O'Bear in that behalf, leave is granted to file the report of the Special Master in this cause.

Pueblo of Laguna, Appellant, 374 vs. Jose Candelaria et al. — The motion for further [illegible] of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this [illegible] was submitted by Mr. Frederick [illegible] Taylor in behalf of Mr. Frank W. Clancy for the appellee in support of the motion.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, 23 Original. vs. The State of Texas. — The motion of Southwest Petroleum [illegible], for return of Receivers' Bond No. 101, and the appurtenant [illegible] was submitted by Mr. [illegible] Baker for the Southwest Petroleum [illegible] with leave to counsel for the Receiver to file reply within three days.

The Director General of Railroads, Petitioner, 661 vs. Mabel Bennett, Administratrix, etc. and The Director General of Railroads, Petitioner, 662 vs. Minnie Templin, Administratrix, etc. — The petition for writs of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. [illegible] Clark Mason for the petitioner and by Mr. Frank F. Davis for the respondent.

Walker D. Hines, as Agent, etc., Petitioner, 667 vs. Harvey L. Meyser. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. William Clark Mason for the petitioner and by Mr. Frank F. Davis for the respondent.

Illinois Central Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, 620 vs. C. B. Johnson. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. [illegible] for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. W. S. Horton and Mr. B. V. Fletcher for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. [illegible] Benson for the defendant in error.

John Barton Payne, as Agent, etc., Petitioner, 631 vs. Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Henley C. Booth and Mr. William F. Herrin for the petitioner and by Mr. Neal Powers and Mr. Warren H. Pillsbury for the respondents.

The First National Bank of Casselton, North Dakota, Petitioner,
550 vs.
Frank M. Smith.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted by Mr. Matthew W. Murphy for the petitioner.

Lee Wing Wah et al., Petitioners,
658 vs.
Edward White as Commissioner of Immigration, etc.

The petition for writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. J. H. Ralston and Mr. George H. Hoft for the petitioners and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Louis H. Denee, plaintiff in error,
168 vs.
Peter Morrison,

This cause was submitted by Mr. Fred B. Morrill for the plaintiff in error Reese H. Voorhees and F.T. Post for the defendant in error, pursuant to the 20th Rule of this Court.

Elliott Frederick, Trustee, etc., Petitioner,
547 vs.
Fidelity Mutual Life Insurance Company of Philadelphia.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Lowrie C. Barton for the petitioner, and by Mr. George Sutherland for the respondent, pursuant to the 20th Rule of this Court.

Michael Mc Cole,
267 vs.
The Lighter "Howell", her engines, etc., Chelsea Lighterage Company, Inc., Claimant.

It appearing from a certified copy of an order of the United States Circuit of Appeals for the Second Circuit that said Circuit Court of Appeals requests the return of the certificate heretofore forwarded to and filed in this Court,

It is now here ordered by this Court that said certificate be returned to said Circuit Court of Appeals, and that this cause be stricken from the docket.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, January 3d, 1921, continued.

The State of North Dakota,
Complainant,
14, Original. vs.
The State of Minnesota.
the complainant.

On motion of Mr. M. H. Boutelle, four hours were allowed for the oral argument of this cause. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. M. H. Boutelle for

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Tuesday, January 4th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis VanDevanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. M. H. Boutelle it is ordered that Elisabeth Blume, of Newark, State of New Jersey, and Mason B. Lemon, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John F. Miller it is ordered that Winter S. Martin, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of North Dakota,
Complainant,
14, Original. vs.
The State of Minnesota.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. M. H. Boutelle for the complainant and by Mr. John E. Palmer for the defendant, and concluded by Mr. Egbert S. Oakley for the defendant.

Felix Gouled,
250 vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was argued by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for Gouled and by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the United States of America.

Max A. Stoehr, etc., Appellant,
546 vs.
James M. Wallace, et al.

On motion on Mr. Solicitor General Frierson Three hours were allowed for the oral argument of this cause, and leave was granted that three counsel be allowed to argue for appellees. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Louis Marshall for the appellants. Proclamation being made the court is adjourned until

Wednesday, January 5th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Joseph McKenna.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis VanDevanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank H. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson it is ordered that Arthur B. Rigney, Esquire, of Haverhill, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Max W. Stoehr, etc., Appellant,
546 vs.
James N. Wallace et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Louis Marshal for the appellant, by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson; Mr. George L. Ingraham and Mr. John Quinn for the appellees and concluded by Mr. Louis Marshall for the appellant.

Detroit United Railway Company,
Appellant,
492 vs.
City of Detroit et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Charles A. Hughes for the appellant and continued by Mr. Clarence E. Wilson and Mr. Alfred Lucking for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

Honorable Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Eli B. Felsenthal it is ordered that Abraham R. Miller, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paul Bakewell, it is ordered that Paul Bakewell, Jr., Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Detroit United Railway Company,
Appellant;
492 vs.
City of Detroit et al.

Charles I. Dawson, Attorney General,
of the State of Kentucky et al.,
Appellants,
439 vs.
Kentucky Distilleries Warehouse Co.;
and
Charles I. Dawson, Attorney General
, etc., et al., Appellants,
582 vs.
The J. & A. Freiberg Company Inc.

I. Dawson for the appellants,

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Alfred Lucking for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the appellant.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Charles I. Dawson for the appellants, continued by Mr. W. Overton Harris for Louisville Public Warehouse Company, one of the appellants in No. 582, by Mr. William Marshall Bullitt for the appellee in No. 439; by Mr. T. Kennedy Helm and Mr. Levi Cooke for the appellee in No. 582, and concluded by Mr. Charles

Thursday, January 8th., 1931, continued.

LaBelle Iron Works, Appellant,
453 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Charles McGuire for the appellant and continued, by Mr. Solicitor General Thomson for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Friday, January 7th, 1921,

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles McCamic it is ordered that Wright Hugus, Esquire, of Wheeling, State of West Virginia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Henry Butler it is ordered that George L. Shearer, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Martin W. Littleton it is ordered that Myles ... Raleh, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. O. Murfin, it is ordered that Howard M. Campbell, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles S. [illegible] it is ordered that Monas Huffman, Esquire, of Denver, Stateof Colorado, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lauritz G. Haugen, it is ordered that Raphael F. Clough, Esquire, of Mason City, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles F. Wilson it is ordered that Proctor K. Perkins, Esquire, of Hailey, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

LaBelle Iron Works, Appellant,
453 vs.
The United States.

On motion of Mr. Arthur Miller in that behalf, leave is granted to file brief as amicus curiae in this cause.

LaBelle Iron Works, Appellant,
453 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the appellee and concluded by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the appellant.

Truman H. Newberry et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
559 vs.
The United States.

On motion of Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the plaintiffs in error, four and one half hours were allowed for the oral argument of this case. The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the plaintiffs in error and continued by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock...

Monday, January 10th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank H. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John H. Baker, it is ordered that Douglas L. Edmonds, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson it is ordered that Ralph J. Kelley, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Hughes it is ordered that William H. Wadhams, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jesse C. Adkins it is ordered that Paul Beverly Woodfin, Esquire, of Waynesboro, State of Virginia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl R. Chindblom it is ordered that Earl W. Wood, Esquire, of Hamilton, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David Meiner, it is ordered that J. Charles Fenen, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. [illegible] it is ordered that Frederic Cass, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Martin W. Littleton it is ordered that Paul R. Dailey, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Warren Gard it is ordered that George C. Keeley, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Ex Parte In the Matter of
D. H. Riddle, Petitioner,
27, Original.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Frierson leave is granted to file the return to the Rule to show cause in this case.

Anchor Oil Company, Appellant,
188 vs.
W. H. Gray et al.

Leave granted to file brief as amicus curiae in this cause on motion of Mr. Francis W. Clements in that behalf.

Joshua Sykes et al., Petitioners,
627 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Levi Cooke in behalf of Mr. Theodore A. Bell for the petitioners and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. Harry S. Midkely for the respondent.

Quong Ham Wah Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
638 vs.
Industrial Accident Commission
of the State of California et al.

The joint motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Charles H. Bates in behalf of counsel.

George Francis Rowe, Petitioner,
676 vs.
John M. Boyle, U. S. Marshal, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Abner H. Ferguson for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. Roy C. McHenry for the respondent.

The United States of America ex rel
Milwaukee Social Democrat Publishing Company, Plaintiff in error,

155 vs.
Albert S. Burleson, Postmaster General, etc.

On motion of Mr. Seth Shepard for Workingmen's Cooperative Publishing Association, leave is granted to file brief as amicus curiae in this cause.

John W. Seaman et al., Appellants,
647 vs.
Samuel W. Adler.
Edward W. Foristel for the respondent.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. W. J. Hughes for the petitioner and by Mr..

The Supreme Tribe of Ben Hur,
Appellant,
274 vs.
Aurelia J. Cauble et al.
C. Bachelder for the appellees.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Charles M. McCabe, Mr. Samuel D. Miller and Mr. William H. Thompson for the appellant and by Mr. William

Blumenstock Brothers Advertising Agency, Plaintiff in Error,
141 vs.
The Curtis Publishing Company.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Truman H. Newberry et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
559 vs.
The United States of America.
Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the plaintiffs in error.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson and Mr. Frank C. Dailey for the defendant in error and concluded by

Central Union Trust Company of New York, etc., Plaintiff in error,
392 vs.
Francis P. Garvan as Alien Property Custodian;
Edwin C. Merrill, et al., etc.
Plaintiffs in Error,

Francis P. Garvan as Alien Property Custodian;
J. Markham Marshall et al., etc.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
394 vs.
Francis P. Garvan as Alien Property Custodian;

J. Markham Marshall et al., etc.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
395 vs.
Francis P. Garvan, as Alien Property Custodian;
and
Metropolitan Trust Company, etc.,
Plaintiff in Error,
396 vs.
Francis P. Garvan, as Alien Property Custodian.

On motion of Mr. Emory R. Buckner in that behalf four and one-half hours were allowed for the argument of these cases. The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Emory R. Buckner for the plaintiffs in error in No. 394 and 395, and continued by Mr. Perry D. Trafford for the plaintiffs in error in Nos. 392 and 393.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Tuesday, January 11th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson it is ordered that Arthur S. Burkot, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio; Raymond N. Beebe, Esquire, Chicago, State of Illinois and Samuel Leighton Brooks, Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry M. Goldfogle it is ordered that Boris M. Komar, Esquire of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James W. Orr, it is ordered that Arthur C. Brown, Esquire of Kansas City, State of Missouri be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

United Shoe Machinery Corporation et al., Appellants,
476 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the appellee, it is ordered that this cause be re-assigned for argument on Monday, February 28th next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

The United States of America, Appellant,
550 vs.
United Shoe Machinery Corporation et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson, of counsel for the appellant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Ex Parte In the Matter of the City of Dallas, Petitioner, --- Original.

The motion for leave to file petition for writ of mandamus herein was submitted by Mr. Francis Marion Etheridge for the petitioner.

Central Trust Company of New York, etc., Plaintiff in error,
392 vs.
Francis P. Garvan, as Alien Property Custodian;
Edwin G. Merrill, et al., etc., Plaintiffs in Error,
393 vs.
Francis P. Garvan as Alien Property Custodian;
J. Markham Marshall et al., etc., Plaintiffs in error,
394 vs.
Francis P. Garvan as Alien Property Custodian;
J. Markham Marshall et al., etc., Plaintiffs in Error,
395 vs.
Francis P. Garvan as Alien Property Custodian;
and
Metropolitan Trust Company, etc., Plaintiff in error,
396 vs.

The argument of these causes was continued by Mr. Walter F. Taylor for the plaintiff in error in No. 396; by Mr. Lucien H. Boggs and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Spellacy for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Emory A. Buckner for the plaintiffs in error in Nos. 394 and 395.

Charles L. Baender, Appellant,
514 vs.
Frank Barnett, Sheriff, etc.,
for the appellee.

This cause was argued by Mr. Levi Cooke for the appellant and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart

Merchants Loan & Trust Company,
Trustee, etc., Plaintiff in error,
508 vs.
Julius F. Smietanka, formerly U. S.
Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Albert M. Hales for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, January 12th, 1921,

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day,

Willis Van Devanter

Mahlon Pitney,

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

John H. Clarke,

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. T. Milans, it is ordered that Max W. Zabel, Esquire of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. M. Doremus, it is ordered that Luman W. Goodenough, Esquire and Arthur J. Lacy, Esquire of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles [illegible] it is ordered that Roscoe C. McCulloch, Esquire and Curtis C. Curtis, Esquire, of Canton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fulton [illegible] Brylawski it is ordered that Gustavus Loevinger, Esquire of St. Paul, State of Minnesota be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis [illegible] Etheridge it is ordered that James Joseph Collins, Esquire of Dallas, State of Texas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Merchants Loan & Trust Company,
Trustee, etc.,
Plaintiff in Error,

[illegible]

Julius F. Smietanka, formerly U. S. Collector of Internal Revenue.	The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the defendant in error and concluded by Mr. Albert M. Kales for the plaintiff in Error.
Eldorado Coal & Mining Company, plaintiff in error, 609 vs. Harry W. Mager, Collector, etc.	This cause was argued by Mr. Herbert Pope for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the defendant in error.
The Heirs of Samuel Garland, deceased, Appellants, 129 vs. The Choctaw Nation.	This cause was argued by Mr. Harry Peyton for the appellants and by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the appellee. One week was allowed both sides to file additional briefs on the right to appeal.
American Steel Foundries, Petitioner, 131 vs. Robert Whitehead, Commissioner of Patents.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. George L. Wilkinson for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Thursday, January 13th, 1921,

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devantor,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank H. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., it is ordered that Percy H. Towne, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California and J. Colby Bassett, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. B. Council it is ordered that W. L. G. Gibson, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania be admitted to practice as anattorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Townsend it is ordered that Harris B. Galpin, Esquire of Muskegon, State of Michigan be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. A. Hostetler it is ordered that Archibald Lindsey, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George L. McKesby it is ordered that David R. Faries, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl R. Chindblom it is ordered that William J. Peck, Esquire, of Peoria, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this court and he was

Missouri, Kansas and Texas Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error,
142 vs.
Thomas M. Reynolds.

It is ordered that this cause be passed per stipulation of counsel pursuant to the 26th Rule.

American Steel Foundries, Petitioner,
131 vs.
[illegible], Commissioner of Patents.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Nathan Heard for the Simplex Electric Heating Company, by special leave of Court, and concluded by Mr. George L. Wilkinson for the petitioner.

Henry Ralph and Mary Thoms, Plaintiffs in Error,
132 vs.
Harry W. Howarth, Administrator.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Byron C. Burbank for the plaintiffs in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Panama Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error,
133 vs.
Wool Pigott, a minor, by his guardian ad litem George Morrell.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Frank Feuille and Mr. Walter F. Van Dame for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Theodore C. Hinckley for the defendant in error.

The Oregon-Washington Railroad & Navigation Company, Appellant,
134 vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. William R. Harr for the appellant and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Davis for the appellee.

The Western Pacific Railroad Company, Appellant,
136 vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. William C. Prentiss for the appellant and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Davis for the appellee.

The United States ex rel C. E. Sykes, Plaintiff in Error,
135 vs.
John Barton Payne, Secretary of the Interior.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Francis W. Clements for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Friday, January 14th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis VanDevanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank H. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John M. Woolsey it is ordered that William Archer Purrington, Esquire, and Frank J. McConnell, Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, it is ordered that Ralph J. Schwarz, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana and George W. Wylie, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William D. [illegible] it is ordered that Francis B. Critchlow, Esquire of Salt Lake City, State of Utah be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Ex Parte In the Matter of Hussein Lutfi Bey, Master of the Turkish Government Steamship "Gul Djemal", -- Orig'l. Petitioner,

The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of prohibition and / or a writ of mandamus herein was submitted by Mr. John M. Woolsey for the petitioner. Suggestions of the Spanish Ambassador on behalf of the Turkish or Ottoman Government submitted by Mr. Frank J. McConnell in that behalf.

The United States ex rel C. E. Sykes, Plaintiff in error,
135 vs.
John Barton Payne, Secretary of

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Francis W. Clements for the plaintiff in error, by Mr. Leslie C. Garnett for the defendant in error and concluded by Mr. Francis W. Clements for the plaintiff in error.

Fitch, Cornell & Company,
Plaintiff in error,
137 vs.
The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Harold C. Aron for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear counsel for the defendant in error.

The Baldwin Company et al.,
Appellants,
139 vs.
R. J. Howard Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Lawrence Maxwell for the appellants and by Mr. Samuel S. Watson for the appellee.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, January 17th, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met this day at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Joseph [illegible],

Oliver [illegible] Holmes,

William R. Day,

William [illegible] Lamar,

[illegible] Pitney,

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

John H. Clarke,

Frank H. Gates, Esquire, Marshal,

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. [illegible], it is ordered that John Allen McWane, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and that he be sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry S. Pitney, it is ordered that Harry G. Wexler, Esquire, of [illegible], State of [illegible], be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and that he be sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harold [illegible], it is ordered that Robert Ingersoll Marsh, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and that he be sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. [illegible] it is ordered that Washington, S. Hudson, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and that he be sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Evans Hughes it is ordered that Arthur E. Nelson, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota and Warren Bigelow, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and that they be sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. [illegible] it is ordered that Edward A. Polo, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and that he be sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. H. Jennings it is ordered that Jerry J. Murphy, Esquire, of Juneau, Territory of Alaska, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. S. Bailey it is ordered that Rollin L. Hewitt, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Melville D. Church it is ordered that Hylie C. Matheson, Esquire, of New York City and Marshall M. Truman, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Bunsford L. Hammer it is ordered that F. Carroll Naylor, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Wood it is ordered that Nelson J. Bozarth, Esquire, of Valparaiso, State of Indiana be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Park Trammell it is ordered that Fred M. Davis, Esquire, of Tallahassee, State of Florida be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Pere Marquette Railway Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
J. F. French and Company.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

105

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

(Mr. Justice Holmes took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

Eugene Sol Louie, Petitioner, 337 vs. The United States of America. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

(The Chief Justice took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

St. Louis & San Francisco Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, 117 vs. The Public Service Commission of the State of Missouri. — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Pitney.
Mr. Justice Clarke.

Ex parte In the Matter of James Thompson Muir, Master of the British Admiralty Transport "Clemsden", Petitioner. 18, Original. — This cause came on to be heard on the petition for a writ of prohibition and / or a writ of mandamus and the return to the rule to show cause, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by the Court that said rule to show cause be discharged and that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

W. S. Bullock, Judge of the Circuit Court of the Fifth Judicial Circuit of the State of Florida, and William S. Hood, Trustee,

Plaintiffs in error,

268 vs.

The State of Florida upon the relation of the Railroad Commission of The State of Florida, et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Florida and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

W. S. Bullock, Judge of the Circuit Court of the Fifth Judicial Circuit of the State of Florida, and William S. Hood, Trustee,

Plaintiffs in error,

262 vs.

The State of Florida upon the relation of the Railroad Commission of the State of Florida et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the transcript of record filed on the writ of error to stand as a return to the writ.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

W. S. Bullock, Judge of the Circuit Court of the Fifth Judicial Circuit of the State of Florida and William S. Hood, Trustee,

Plaintiffs in error,

262 vs.

The State of Florida upon the rela-

tion of the Railroad Commission of the State of Florida et al. — On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Florida, and was argued by counsel,

On consideration whereof, It is now hereby ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

J. W. Goldsmith, Jr-Grant Company, Plaintiff in error, — In error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia.

214. vs.

The United States of America.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be and the same is hereby, affirmed.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Henry Ralph and Mary Thoms, Plaintiffs in error, — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

132. vs.

Harry W. Howarth, Administrator of the Estate of Theodore Thoms, Jr., deceased.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The United States of America ex rel C. E. Sykes, Plaintiff in error,

135 vs.

John Barton Payne, Secretary of the Interior. — In error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, andwas argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Fitch, Cornell & Company, Plaintiff in error, — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

137 vs.

The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Louis H. Denee, Plaintiff in error, — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

168. vs.

Peter Morrison.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Ex Parte In the Matter of the City of Dallas, Petitioner, --- Original. — On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Ex Parte In the Matter of Hussein Lufti Bey, Master of the Turkish

Government Steamship "Gul Djemal"
--- Original. Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for writs of prohibition and / or mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Quong Ham Wah Company,
Plaintiff in error,
638 vs.
Industrial Accident Company of the State of California, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 28th next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Pueblo of Laguna, Appellant,
374 vs.
Jose Candelaria et al.

On consideration of the motion for further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Illinois Central Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in error,
620 vs.
C. B. Johnson.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Joshua Sykes, A. M. Dean, John Ferguson, and Joseph Crosby,
Petitioners,
627 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari here in to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

John Barton Payne, as Agent under Section 206, Transportation Act 1920. (Southern Pacific Railroad). Petitioner.
631 vs.
Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California and Fernanda Brizzelara et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

John W. Seaman, Elmyr A. Laughlin and Robert T. Laughlin, Appellants,
647 vs.
Samuel W. Adler.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Lee Wing Wah et al., Petitioners,
658 vs.
Edward White, as Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of San Francisco.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The First National Bank of Casselton North Dakota, Petitioner,
660 vs.

Frank M. Smith. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The Director General of Railroads, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari to the
661 vs. United States Circuit Court of Appeals for
Mabel Bennett, Administratrix the Third Circuit.
of Frank Bennett, deceased.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The Director General of Railroads, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari to the
662 vs. United States Circuit Court of Appeals for
Minnie Templin, Administratrix the Third Circuit.
of Burd Templin, deceased.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Walker D. Hines, as Agent appointed under Transportation Act of 1920, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.
677 vs.
Harvey K. Keyser.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the

the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

George Francis Rowe, Petitioner,
676 vs.
John M. Boyle, as United States Marshal, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Miller and Lux, Inc.,
Plaintiff in error,
347 vs.
The Sacramento & San Joaquin Drainage District.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hiram W. Johnson in that behalf.

Anchor Oil Company,
Appellant,
600 vs.
The P. & M. Company.

The suggestion of diminution of the record and motion for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Melville D. Church in behalf of Mr. Melville Church for the respondent.

The Heirs of Samuel Garland, deceased, Appellants,
129. vs.
The Choctaw Nation.

On motion of Mr. Harry Peyton in that behalf, leave is hereby granted to file reply brief in this cause.

John W. Seaman et al., Appellants,
647 vs.
Samuel W. Adler.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey in behalf of counsel for the appellee in support of the motion. On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Frierson in behalf of counsel for the appellants, leave is hereby granted to file brief in opposition thereto.

Ex Parte In the Matter of The National Park Bank of New York, --- Original. Petitioner, for the petitioner.

The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted by Mr. Warren Bigelow in behalf of counsel

Virginia Trust Company, et al., Executors, etc., Plaintiffs in Error,
259 vs.
The Commonwealth of Virginia et al.

The suggestion of diminution of the record and motion for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. John S. Barbour for the plaintiffs in error in support of the motion and by Mr. J. D. Hank, Jr., for the defendants in error in opposition thereto.

Alexander New et al., Receivers, etc., Petitioners,
586 vs.
Effie McMillan, Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Arthur Miller and Mr. Ephraim H. Foster for the petitioners.

British Columbia Mills Tug & Barge Company, Petitioner,
664 vs.
A. W. Milroie.
spondent.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Charles H. Farrell and Mr. W. B. Stratton for the petitioner, and by Mr. William H. Gorham for the re-

Kokoma Steel Wire Company, Petitioner,
666 vs.
The Republic of France.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. John R. Browne for the petitioner.

Carlisle Packing Company, Petitioner,
672 vs.
Ole Sandanger.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. James A. Kerr and Mr. Evan S. McCord for the petitioner.

Anchor Company, Appellant,
600 vs.
The P. & M. Company.

The motion to dismiss or affirm herein was submitted by Mr. Otto R. Barnett for the appellee in support of the motion and by Mr. Melville Church for the appellant in opposition thereto.

The Pullman Company, petitioner,
469 vs.

The State Industrial Commission. On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court, Appellate Division, Third Department, of the State of New York.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Wherefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

James R. Ward, Plaintiff in error,
151 vs.
The People of the State of Illinois ex rel. Chicago Bar Association.

This cause was passed pursuant to the 26th Rule of this Court.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in error,
143 vs.
L. C. Russell.
in error.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Otto Christensen for the defendant

Kenneth D. Steere, Appellant,
144 vs.
W. W. Beaty et al.
pellees.

This cause was argued by Mr. George Warner Swain for the appellant and by Mr. W. B. Councill for the ap-

Charles S. Sickel, Plaintiff in error,
145 vs.
The Commonwealth of Virginia.

This cause was argued by Mr. J. D. Hank, Jr., for the defendant in error and submitted by Mr. David H. Leake and Mr. Walter Leake for the plaintiff in error.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error,
147 vs.
William E. Rogers et al.;
and
The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error,
148 vs.
Margie L. Highsmith.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Garnett for the plaintiff in error.

proclamation being made the court in adjournment

Tuesday, January 18th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leslie C. Garnett, it is ordered that Walter J. Southon, Jr., Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, and A. Kingsley Love, Esquire, of Leonardtown, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William S. Culbertson, it is ordered that W. W. Griffin, Esquire, of Niles, Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John E. Raker, it is ordered that Martin L. Haines, Esquire of Los Angeles, Stateof California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Conrad H. Syme it is ordered that Edward Stafford, Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Borah it is ordered that Henry S. Ballard, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Wabash Railroad Company.

169 vs.
Board of Review of Cook County Illinois. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
23, Original. vs.
The State of Texas.

On motion of Mr. John Spalding Flannery it is ordered that the Fourth Report of the Receiver in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, filed.

Postal Telegraph Cable Company, plaintiff in error,
166 vs.
The City of Fremont.

This cause was submitted by Mr. John H. Sebrell, Jr., for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. R. E. Evans for the defendant in error.

The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, Plaintiff in error,
157. vs.
Daniel J. Perry.

It is ordered that this cause be passed pursuant to the 26th Rule of this Court.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in error,
147 vs.
William E. Rogers, et al.
and
The United States of America, Plaintiff in error,
148 vs.
Margie L. Highsmith.

The argument of these cases was concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Garnett for the plaintiff in error and the cases submitted by Mr. William C. Reid for the defendants in error.

Armour and Company, et al.,
149 vs.
The City of Dallas, et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Francis Marion Etheridge for the appellants and by Mr. Thomas J. Freeman and Mr. James J. Collins for the appellees.

Louis F. Nagel,
Plaintiff in error,
150 vs.
The State of Iowa.
in error.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. D. Milligan for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. H. M. Havner and Mr. F. C. Davidson for the defendant

New Orleans Land Company,
Appellant,
152 vs.
Leader Realty Company, Ltd.

This cause was argued by Mr. Charles Louque for the appellant and submitted by Mr. William Winans Wall for the appellee.

Ben B. Lindsey, plaintiff in error
154. vs.
The People of the State of Colorado at the relation of John A. Rush, District Attorney, etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. Edward P. Costigan for the plaintiff in error and submitted by Mr. Victor E. Keyes and Mr. William R. Ramsey for the defendant in error. Leave was granted to counsel for the plaintiff in error to file an additional brief within seven days.

The United States of America ex rel. Milwaukee Social Democratic Publishing Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
155 vs.
Albert S. Burleson, Postmaster General, etc.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Henry F. Cochems for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, January 19th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened at ten

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson, it is ordered that James F. Terry, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, and Walter E. Kelly, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank E. Doremus it is ordered that William E. Baubie, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. Wallace Dempsey it is ordered that John J. Irving, Esquire, of Binghamton, State of New York be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl L. Chindblom it is ordered that Paul E. Duzeski, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander H. Clark it is ordered that Percy L. Housel, Esquire, of Riverhead, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. A. Brown, it is ordered that Maxwell V. Boghtol, Esquire, of Lincoln, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. G. Henderson, it is ordered that Richard S. Wiggin, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Giuseppe Cavallaro, Petitioner,
167 vs.
Steamship Carlo Poma, etc.;

Giovanni Luzzato et al., etc.,
Appellants,
317 vs.
The Steamship "Pesaro" etc.;
and
The Texas Company, Petitioner,
555 vs.
Hogarth Shipping Corporation, Ltd.
Owner, etc., et al..

On motion of Mr. Charles Henry Butler in that behalf, It is ordered that these cases be, and they are hereby, passed, pursuant to the provisions of Section 9 of Rule 26 of this Court.

Joseph B. Boutel et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
165 vs.
Oscar G. Foreman et al., Trustees,
etc.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The United States of America,
ex rel. Milwaukee Social Democratic
Publishing Company,
Plaintiff in error,
155 vs.
Albert S. Burleson, Postmaster
General, etc.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Henry F. Cochems for the plaintiff in error, by Mr. William H. Lamar for the defendant in error and concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the defendant in error.

Silver King Coalition Mines Company,
Petitioner,
158 vs.
Conkling Mining Company;
and
Silver Coalition Mines Company,
Appellant,
187 vs.
Conkling Mining Company.

These cases were argued by Mr. Thomas Marioneaux for the petitioner and appellant and by Mr. F. B. Critchlow and Mr. William W. Ray for the respondent and appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Thursday, January 20th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke.
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William S. Kenyon it is ordered that Ralph H. Munro, Esquire of Fairfield, State of Iowa be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Simon Lyon it is ordered that Albert E. Steinem, Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia, and Albert J. Weisberg, Esquire of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick L. Fishback it is ordered that Edgar Liberty Wood, Esquire, and Kossuth Kent Kennan, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick W. Lehmann, it is ordered that George J. Carew, Esquire, of Youngstown, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Maggie Harjo, Appellant,
160 vs.
W. A. Kunkle et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Lewis C. Lawson for the appellant, and submitted by Mr. Preston C. West and Mr. A. A. Davidson for the appellees.

Hartford Life Insurance Company,

Cecelia Blimcoe, Administratrix, etc.,

This cause was argued by Mr. Frederick W. Lehmann for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Charles E. Morrow for the defendant in error.

The Great Northern Railway Company, Plaintiff in error,
163 vs.
The City of Minneapolis.

This cause was argued by Mr. E. C. Lindley for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Richard S. Wiggin for the defendant in error.

Alaska Fish Salting & By-Products Company, Plaintiff in error,
166 vs.
Walstein G. Smith.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. R. H. Robertson for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Friday, January 21, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward T. Taylor, it is ordered that William N. Vallo, Esquire, and William H. Ferguson, Esquire of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Andrew B. Memick, it is ordered that George J. Broaker, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Company et al.,
Appellants,
178. vs.
J. F. Hasty & Sons et al.

This cause was submitted by Mr. George A. McConnell and Mr. John M. Moore for the appellants and by Mr. W. E. Hemmingway, Mr. D. H. Cantrell and Mr. J. F. Loughborough for the appellees.

Alaska Fish Salting & By-Products Company,
Plaintiff in error,
166 vs.
Walstein C. Smith.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. R. E. Robertson for the plaintiff in error by Mr. J. C. Murphy for the defendant in error and concluded by Mr. R. E. Robertson for the plaintiff in error.

Sanger Brothers a copartnership, etc.,
Plaintiffs in error,
170 vs.

Emily Hunsucker et al.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Henry C. Coke for the plaintiffs in error.

No appearance was entered for the defendants in error.

Stark Borthers Nurseries & Orchards Company, Petitioner,
171. vs.
William P. Stark et al., Trustees, etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. Andrew B. Remick for the petitioner and by Mr. Xenophen P. Wilfley for the respondents.

Edward Rutledge Timber Company et al., Appellants,
172 vs.
Alra G. Farrell.

This cause was argued by Mr. Stiles W. Burr for the appellants and by Mr. S. M. Stockslager for the appellee. Leave was granted by the Court to Mr. Stiles W. Burr, to file a reply brief for the appellants within one week.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, January 24th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Attorney General Palmer it is ordered that Otis Wingo, Esquire, of DeQueen, State of Arkansas, and Thomas J. Fitzgerald, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson it is ordered that James P. Bramhall, Esquire, and Ashby Williams, Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia, Maurice T. Dooling, Jr., Esquire of San Francisco, State of California and George P. Cooper, Esquire, of Huntsville, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Champ Clark it is ordered that Bennett C. Clark, Esquire of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. W. Hastings it is ordered that R. B. F. Hummer, Esquire, of Henryetta, State of Oklahoma be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Stanley D. Willis, it is ordered that Raymond H. Kenyon, Esquire of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Emmett Tinley it is ordered that J. W. Kridelbaugh, Esquire, of Charlton, State of Iowa be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. M. M. Neely it is ordered that Ellis A. Yost, Esquire, of Morgantown, State of West Virginia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Peter Geddes, Joseph R. Walker, Joseph S. Baer, et al., Appellants, vs. Anaconda Copper Mining Company et al.

25

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is here by, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Montana for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds concurs in the result.)

E. Hilton Jackson, Receiver of the First Co-operative Building Association of Georgetown, D. C. Petitioner, vs. John Lewis Smith and Edwin L. Wilson.

130.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and

and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that the judgment of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The Journal and Tribune Company,
Appellant,
86 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.
The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

per Mr. Justice Pitney.

George G. LaMotte and Anna Marx Lamotte, Appellants, Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.
121 vs.
The United States of America.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for Eighth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby modified as indicated in the opinion of this Court, and, as so modified, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma with directions to that Court to conform its decree to the decree of the Circuit Court of Appeals as modified by this Court, and to take such further proceedings as may be consistent with the opinion of this Court herein and in conformity with law.

per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Panama Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in error,
133 vs.
Noel Pigott, a minor, by his
guardian ad litem, George Maxwell

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by Counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Canal Zone.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Central Union Trust Company, of New York, Individually and as Trustee, etc.,

Plaintiff in error,

392 vs.

Francis P. Garvan, as Alien Property Custodian.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause cameon to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Edwin G. Merrill, James Speyer, and Frank A. Vanderlip, Individually and as Trustees, etc.,

Plaintiffs in Error,

393 vs.

Francis P. Garvan, as Alien Property Custodian.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause cameon to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

J. Markham Marshall, Walter T. Rosen, and Rudolph Metz, as Trustees, etc.
Plaintiffs in Error,
394 vs.
Francis P. Garvan, as Alien Property Custodian.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

J. Markham Marshall, Walter T. Rosen and Rudolph Metz, as Trustees etc., Plaintiffs in error,
395 vs.
Francis P. Garvan, as Alien Property Custodian.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Metropolitan Trust Company of the City of New York, Trustee, etc., Plaintiff in error, vs. Francis P. Garvan, as Alien Property Custodian. — In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

396

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Charles S. Sickel, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Commonwealth of Virginia. — In error to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

145.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Louis F. Nagel, Plaintiff in error, vs. The State of Iowa. — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa.

150

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Maggie Marjo, Appellant,
160 vs.
W. A. Kunkle, Prairie Oil & Gas Company et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

The cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The Great Northern Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error,
163 vs.
The City of Minneapolis.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Sanger Brothers a copartnership, composed of Isaac Sanger, Cornelia Sanger, Sam Sanger and Alexander Sanger, Plaintiffs in Error,
170 vs.
Emily Hunsucker and C. W. Branson.

In error to the Court of Civil Appeals, Second Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Civil Appeals, Second Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

John W. Seaman et al.,

Appellants,

647 vs. Samuel W. Adler.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Ex Parte In the Matter of the National Park Bank of New York, Petitioner, 28, Orig'l.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Ex Parte In the Matter of the National Park Bank of New York, Petitioner, 28, Orig'l.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that cause be shown by Honorable Richard W. Walker, Honorable Nathan P. Bryan and Honorable Alex C. King, Judges of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, before this Court, at the City of Washington, on Monday, February 28th, 1921 or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard, why the prayer of said petition should not be granted.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Miller & Lux, Incorporated, Plaintiff in error, 347 vs. The Sacramento and San Joaquin Drainage District.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 28th next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Virginia Trust Company et al., Executors, etc., Plaintiffs in error, 259 vs. The Commonwealth of Virginia.

On consideration of the motion for a writ of certiorari on suggestion of diminution of the record herein,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Anchor Company, Appellant,
600 vs.
The P. & M. Company.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Carlisle Packing Company,
Petitioner,
672 vs.
Ole Sandanger.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and of the argument of counsel, thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Alexander New and Henry C. Ferris, Receivers for the Missouri, Oklahoma & Gulf Railway Company,
Petitioners,
586 vs.
Effie McMillan, Administratrix of the Estate of Ben J. McMillan, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Kokoma Steel Wire Company,
Petitioner,
666. vs.

The Republic of France. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The Missouri Pacific Railway Company, Plaintiff in error,
265 vs.
McGrew Coal Company;
and
Anna Lang, As administratrix, etc.,
Petitioner,
290 vs.
New York Central Railroad Company.

It is ordered by the Court that these cases, which have heretofore been placed on the summary docket, be assigned for argument, at the head of the call, on Monday, February 28th next.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
vs.
The State of Texas, Defendant; The United States of America, Intervener. } 23, Original.

[January 24, 1921.]

The motion of the Sinclair Oil and Gas Company, filed herein on December 20, 1920, for an order to require Frederic A. Delano, Esq., Receiver, to refund to it one-sixteenth (1/16) of the proceeds of the oil produced from certain premises in said motion described and heretofore deposited with said Receiver pursuant to the order of this Court, together with the interest collected thereon by said Receiver, and to require said Receiver to surrender and pay to said Sinclair Oil and Gas Company one-sixteenth (1/16) of the oil or the proceeds thereof delivered to said Receiver since the fifteenth day of October, 1920, is hereby denied, without prejudice.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
vs.
The State of Texas, Defendant; The United States of America, Intervener. } 23, Original.

[January 24, 1921.]

The motion of C. J. Benson, William Murdock, and James R. Armstrong, filed herein December 20, 1920, for an order requiring Frederic A. Delano, Esq., Receiver, to file an inventory of certain material and equipment purchased by him and paid for out of the proceeds of the oil produced by him from certain premises in said motion described, and to account for the value thereof; and requiring said Receiver to file forthwith an itemized statement of moneys charged by him against certain wells and a statement of all sums of money realized by him from certain wells, and for other relief, as in said motion specified, is hereby denied, without prejudice.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
vs.
The State of Texas, Defendant; The United States of America, Intervener. } 23, Original.

[January 24, 1921.]

The petition of the Oklahoma Petroleum and Gasoline Company, filed herein on December 20, 1920, for an order requiring Frederic A. Delano, Esq., Receiver, to file a statement of expenses incurred by him from May 16, 1920, to July 1, 1920, in operating certain wells designated in said petition, and requiring said Receiver to pay to said company the proceeds of one-sixteenth (1/16) of the oil produced from said wells from April 1, 1920, to November 15, 1920, and the interest collected by said Receiver upon said proceeds, and requiring said Receiver to refund to said company one-third (1/3) of the three-sixteenths (3/16) of the proceeds of the oil from said wells paid to said Receiver since November 15, 1920, and that said company be not required hereafter to pay to said Receiver more than two-sixteenths (2/16) of the oil and gas produced from said wells, and for other relief, is hereby denied, without prejudice.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
vs.
The State of Texas, Defendant; The United States of America, Intervener. } 23, Original.

[January 24, 1921.]

Upon consideration of the motion of Southwest Petroleum Company, filed herein January 3, 1921, for an order directing Frederic A. Delano, Esq., Receiver herein, to return to said company pursuant to the order of June 7, 1920, a certain well known as Receiver's well No. One hundred and eighty (180), together with the land appurtenant thereto and the structures, equipment, and material pertaining to said well, and the response of the Receiver to said motion filed January 5, 1921, and the response of the United States filed January 22, 1921, It is ordered that said Receiver do return to said Southwest Petroleum Company said well No. One hundred and eighty (180), which lies south of the south edge of the sand bed of the Red River as it was on the first day of April, 1920 (marked generally by the border line of vegetation along the edge of the flood plain), together with the land appurtenant thereto lying to the south of the south edge of the sand bed of said river, and the structures, equipment, and material pertaining to said well, and the net proceeds of the production thereof that have come to the hands of said Receiver, less operating expenses and reservations, upon terms that said Southwest Petroleum Company comply with the provisions contained in the order of this Court made June 7, 1920, respecting the return of certain lands lying south of the south edge of the sand bed of said river which were on the first day of April, 1920, in the possession of persons claiming under patents from the State of Texas, and not included in the river bed lands as in said order defined.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Mr. Justice McKenna announced that the Court will take a recess from Monday, the 31st instant, to Monday, February 28th next.

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
23, Original. vs.
The State of Texas.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Frierson, of counsel for the United States of America, Intervenor herein, leave is hereby granted to file responses of the United States to the

motions of The Sinclair Oil & Gas Company to be relieved of payment of any general expense, etc., and of the Southwest Petroleum Company for the return of receivers well No. 180, etc.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
523 vs.
Boze Yuginovich et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the plaintiff in error.

Joseph H. Burdeau, Appellant,
646 vs.
J. C. McDowell.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the appellant.

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
23, Original vs.
The State of Texas.

The motion of the General Oil Company to set aside, amend and change decree dated December 6th, 1920, submitted by Mr. K. C. Barkley in that behalf, with leave to Mr. J. S. Flannery, Counsel for the Receiver to file brief in opposition on or before Friday next.

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
23, Original. vs.
The State of Texas.

The motion of National Petroleum & Refining Company for the return of patented lands submitted by Mr. K. C. Barkley in that behalf with leave to Mr. J. S. Flannery, counsel for the Receiver, to file brief in opposition on or before Friday next.

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
23, Original.
The State of Texas.

The motion of T. P. Roberts et al., to require Receiver to return certain patented lands was submitted by Mr. A. H. Carrigan in that behalf with leave to Mr. J. S. Flannery, counsel for the Receiver, to file brief in opposition on or before Friday next.

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
23, Original. vs.
The State of Texas.

The motion of T. P. Roberts et al., to require Receiver to account and pay to them twenty-thousand dollars and interest was submitted by Mr. A. H. Carrigan in that behalf with leave to Mr. J. S. Flannery, counsel for the Receiver, to file brief in opposition on or before Friday next.

Great Northern Railway Company, et al., Petitioners,
686 vs.
Merchants Elevator Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. John F. Finerty and Mr. F. G. Dorety for the petitioners.

Ex Parte In the Matter of the Lincoln Gas & Electric Light Company, Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted by Mr. Robert A. Brown and Mr. Maxwell V. Bogthol for the petitioner.

Arthur J. Bahn, petitioner,
605 vs.
Walker D. Hines, Director General of Railroads.

On motion of Mr. Walter C. Clephane in that behalf, it is ordered that John Barton Payne, as Director General of Railroads be substituted in the place of Walker D. Hines resigned, as the party respondent in this cause.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
23, Original vs.
The State of Texas.

The motion of Continental Oil Company for leave to intervene herein was submitted by Mr. Seth Shepard in that behalf, with leave to Mr. J. S. Flannery, of counsel for the Receiver, to file brief in opposition on or before Friday next.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
23, Original. vs.
The State of Texas.

The motion of Continental Oil Company for direction to the receiver with reference to protection of land claimed by said company against drainage through wells on adjacent land, was submitted by Mr. Seth Shepard in that behalf with leave to Mr. J. S. Flannery, of counsel the Receiver, to file brief in opposition on or before Friday next.

The Commerce Trust Company, Petitioner,
671 vs.
Samuel Rusnak, Trustee, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. W. H. Sears, Mr. Eugene L. Garey, Mr. Paul L'Amoreaux, and Mr. Lewis A. Stebbins for the petitioner.

The City of Hillsboro Oregon, Plaintiff in Error,
618 vs.
Public Service Commission of Oregon, etc et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted by Mr. Alexander Britton in behalf of Mr. Charles A. Hart for the defendants in error in support of the motion.

New Bedford Dry Dock Company,
Appellant,
520 vs.
Blake G. Purdy, claimant of the Steamer "Jack-O-Lantern".

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. William H. Donovan in behalf of Mr. Lee M. Friedman for the appellant.

Ex parte in the Matter of Matthew Addy Steamship and Commerce Corpration, Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file a petitition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted by Mr. Ashby Williams in behalf of counsel the the petitioner.

William M. Duncan, Receiver, etc.,
Petitioner,
684 vs.
Horace F. Baker, Receiver, etc.
spondent.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Arthur O. Fording for the petitioner and by Mr. John Quinn for the re-

William R. Castle, Lorrin A. Thurston and Alfred L. Castle, Trustees under the will of James Bicknell Castle, Petitioners,
629 vs.
Julia White Castle.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioners to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The De Lamar Company, Ltd.,
Plaintiff in error,
179 vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. H. Johnson for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Nebeker, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Underwood for the defendant in error with leave to counsel to file additional briefs on or before January 31st, next.

Clay Arthur Pierce et al.,
Appellants,
173 vs.

Monday, January 24th, 1921, continued.

The United States of America. This cause was argued by Mr. Louis Marshall for the appellants, and by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the appellee.

W. E. Stewart,
Plaintiff in error,
174 vs.
E. G. McAllister et al. This cause was argued by Mr. Don A. Bliss for the plaintiff in error, and was submitted by Mr. J. C. George for the defendants in error.

The United States of America,
plaintiff in error,
175 vs.
The American Chicle Company. This cause was argued by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Charles P. Spooner for the defendant in error.

The Supreme Lodge of the Knights of Pythias, Plaintiff in error,
176. vs.
Sallie M. Overton. This cause was argued by Mr. Lawrence Cooper for the plaintiff in error. No appearance was entered for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court in adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Tuesday, January 25th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Hughes it is ordered that Edward Sandford, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. Russell Alden it is ordered that Jesse B. Adams, Esquire and Walter A. Blount, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

Iowa Gas and Electric Company,
Appellant,
185 vs.
The City of Mount Pleasant, Iowa et al.

This cause was continued per stipulation of counsel.

The Standard Fashion Company,
Petitioner,
177 vs.
Magrane-Houston Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the petitioner. No appearance was entered for the respondent.

The People of the State of New York, Complainants,
2, Original. vs.
The State of New Jersey et al.

On motion of Mr. Charles E. Hughes, in that behalf, three and one-half hours were allowed for the reargument of this cause. This cause was

reargued by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the complainants, and by Mr. Adrian Hiker and by Mr. George W. Wickersham for the defendants.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, January 26th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Winter S. Martin it is ordered that Ray M. Wardall, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George W. Sutton it is ordered that Rufus W. Pearson, Esquire, and Walter W. Preston, Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Mason it is ordered that Floyd B. Lanham, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry W. Moore, it is ordered that Jacob S. White, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duane H. Fox it is ordered that Newton K. Fox, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counselor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Thompson, it is ordered that Edward M. White, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
691 vs.
A. Z. Hutto et al.;
and
The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
692 vs.
A. Z. Hutto.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the plaintiff in error.

Railroad Commission of Wisconsin, et al., Appellants,
694 vs.
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson in behalf of counsel.

Railroad Commission of Wisconsin, et al., Appellants,
694 vs.
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Company.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Frierson in that behalf, leave is granted to file brief of the United States as amicus curiae in this cause.

David M. Goodrich,
plaintiff in error,
603 vs.
William H. Edwards, U. S. Collector of Internal Revenue &c.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Fletcher Lewis in behalf of counsel.

Carlos Carmelo Garcia, Appellant,
648 vs.
James B. Holohan, U. S. Marshal, etc., et al.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause was submitted by Mr. Charles Warren for the appellant.

Southern Iowa Electric Company,
Appellant,

The City of Chariton, Iowa, et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Emmet Tinley for the appellant and by Mr. J. W. Kridelbaugh for the appellees.

The State of Kansas on the relation of Richard J. Hopkins, Attorney General, et al., Appellants,
181 vs.
Wichita Natural Gas Company et al.,

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellants to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuant of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Peter Wilson, Plaintiff in error,
182 vs.
Republic Iron & Steel Company et al.

This cause was continued per stipulation of counsel.

Giuseppe Cavallaro, petitioner,
167 vs.
Steamship Carlo Poma, her engines, etc., Kingdom of Italy, claimant,;
and
Giovanni Luzzato et al., etc.,
Appellants,
317 vs.
The Steamship "Pesaro," etc.;
and
The Texas Company, Petitioner,
555 vs.
Hogarth Shipping Corporation,Ltd., Owner, etc.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Oscar R. Houston for the petitioner in No. 167 and appellants in No. 317; continued by Mr. Van Vechten Veeder for the respondent in No. 167; by Mr. John M. Woolsey for the appellee in No. 317; by Mr. Harold V. Amberg for the petitioner in No. 167 and the appellants in No. 317, and by Mr. John W. Griffin for the petitioner in No. 555.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney, Associate Justices.
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Stewart Hanley it is ordered that Christian H. Lehman, Esquire; LeRoy C. Lyon, Esquire; J. Francis Mahon, Esquire; Fred R. Schmalzriedt, Esquire; William Lucking, Esquire Clarence W. Videan, Esquire, and James M. Jeffries, Esquire of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Reed, it it ordered that John A. Reed, Esquire, of Cedar Rapids, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., it is ordered that Julian Hartridge, Esquire of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter B. Guy, it is ordered that Frank C. Lee, Esquire, of Memphis, State of Tennessee be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and hewas sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. W. Hastings it is ordered that Maurice Dabney Green, Esquire, of Muskogee, State of Oklahoma be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was

Yee Bow, Plaintiff in error,
110 vs.
The City of Cleveland.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Rose Hansen, administratrix, etc., Petitioner,
193 vs.
New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Company.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the Circuit Court of Hudson County, State of New Jersey.

On consideration of the motion to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari filed herein,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for want of prosecution.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

J. L. Hudson, plaintiff in error,
194 vs.
O. L. Hopkins, as County Treasurer, etc.,
and
William E. McGuire, as administrator, etc., plaintiff in error,
195 vs.
E. J. McCurdy, as County Treasurer, &c.

It is ordered that these cases be, and the same are hereby, passed pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

William Breiholz et al.
Plaintiffs in error
196 vs.
The Board of Supervisors of Pocahontas County, Iowa, et al.

It is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed pursuant to section 9 of Rule 26.

Guiseppe Catallaro, petitioner,
167 vs.
Steamship "Carlo Poma" her engines,

etc., Kingdom of Italy, Claimant;

Giovanni Luzzato et al., etc.,
Appellants,

317 vs.

The Steamship "Pesaro", etc.;
and

The Texas Company, petitioner,

555 vs.

Hogarth Shipping Corporation, Ltd.,
Owner, etc.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. John W. Griffin for the petitioner in No. 555, and concluded by Mr. John M. Woolsey for the respondent in No. 555.

Union Pacific Railroad Company,
Petitioner,

183 vs.

James J. E. Burke.

This cause was argued by Mr. Oscar R. Houston for the petitioner and by Mr. Arthur W. Clement for the respondent.

Lower Vein Coal Company, Appellant,

186 vs.

Industrial Board of Indiana et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. William H. Thompson and Mr. Henry W. Moore for the appellant and by Mr. E. M. White and Mr. John A. Riddle for the appellees.

Anchor Oil Company, Appellant,

188 vs.

W. H. Gray et al.,

This cause was argued by Mr. Preston C. West for the appellees and submitted by Mr. John Devereux for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke.
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John F. Miller, it is ordered that Loran Charles Stevenson, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

St. Louis San Francisco Railway Company, Appellant,
636 vs.
George H. Middelkamp, State Treasurer, etc.
parties appellee in this cause.

On motion of Mr. Sidney T. Taliaferro in that behalf, it is ordered that Lorenzo D. Thompson, as State Treasurer and Jesse W. Barrett as Attorney General be substituted as

Iowa Electric Company, Appellant,
189 vs.
City of Fairfield, Iowa, et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. John A. Reed for the appellant and by Mr. Ralph H. Munro for the appellees.

Muscatine Lighting Company, Appellant,
190 vs.
City of Muscatine, Iowa, et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. William Chamberlain for the appellant. No appearance was entered for appellees.

S. A. McHenry et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
191 vs.
Bankers Trust Company et al.
defendants in error.

This cause was argued by Mr. Don A. Bliss for the plaintiffs in error and submitted by Mr. B. F. Louis and Mr. D. E. Glasscock, p. p. for the de-

Missouri, Kansas and Texas Railway Company et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
198 vs.
Hannah L. Zuber.

This cause was argued by Mr. M. D. Green for the plaintiffs in error and petitioners and submitted by Mr. Charles W. Smith for the defendant in error and respondent.

Michael Maguire et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
202 vs.
Timothy A. Reardon et al., etc., et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Maurice T. Dooling, Jr., for the defendants in error and submitted by Mr. J. F. Riley for the plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, January 31st, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day,

Willis Van Devanter,

Mahlon Pitney, Associate Justices.

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Scott Ferris it is ordered that William Webb Venable, Esquire, of Meridian, State of Mississippi be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank K. Nebeker it is ordered that John Francis Crosby, Esquire, of Hartford, State of Connecticut be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. A. Ledbetter, it is ordered thatG. Earl Shaffer, Esquire, of Tulsa, and C. B. Rockwood, Esquire, of Sapulpa, State of Oklahoma be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson it is ordered that James S. Havens, Esquire, of Rochester, State of New York be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James M. Gifford it is ordered that Alfred P. W. Seaman, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice asan attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. A. Jones it is ordered that J. D. Atwood, Esquire, of Roswell, State of New Mexico, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Port of Seattle, Appellant,
107 vs.
Oregon & Washington Railroad Company and J. F. Duthie & Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Charles K. Hogan, Appellant,
120 vs.
William H. O'Neill, Chief of Police of the City of East Orange, New Jersey.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Pitney.

Alaska Fish Salting and By-Products Company, Plaintiff in error,
166 vs.
Walstein G. Smith.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Alaska, Division No. 1.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Alaska, Division No. 1, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Stark Bros. Nurseries and Orchards Company, Petitioner,
171 vs.
William P. Stark and William H. Stark, Trustees, doing business under the name and style of William P. Stark Nurseries.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Victor L. Berger et al.,
460 vs.
The United States of America.

On a certificate to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the first question certified must be answered in the affirmative; that the second question certified must be answered that, to the extent indicated in the opinion, Judge Landis had a lawful right to pass upon the sufficiency of the affidavit; and that the third question certified must be answered in the negative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Day,

Mr. Justice Pitney.

Specially dissenting:

Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Alexander Kahn, Donald Fisher, Robert L. LeCocq, et al., Appellants, vs. August V. Anderson, Warden of the United States Penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kansas. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas.

421.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

William J. Givens, Appellant, vs. Fred G. Zerbst, Warden of the United States Penitentiary at Atlanta, Georgia. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia.

285

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the final order of the said District Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

S. A. McHenry, Thomas Burton, George S. Dobbins, et al., Plaintiffs in error, vs. Bankers Trust Company, The Mission Canal Company, D. W. Glasscock, Receiver, et al. — In error to the Court of Civil Appeals for the First Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

191

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Civil Appeals for the First Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and

Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Supreme Lodge of the Knights of Pythias, Plaintiff in error, vs. Sallie M. Overton. 176

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

W. E. Stewart, Plaintiff in error, vs. E. G. McAllister and Christina McAllister. 174

In error to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Fourth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Civil Appeals for the Fourth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ben B. Lindsey, Plaintiff in error, vs. The People of the State of Colorado at the relation of John A. Rush, District Attorney for the Second Judicial District of the State of Colorado. 154

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex Parte in the Matter of the Lincoln Gas & Electric Light Company, Petitioner. 29, Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte in the Matter of the Lincoln Gas & Electric Light Company, Petitioner, 29, Original.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of mandamus herein, it is now here ordered by the Court that cause be shown by Honorable Martin J. Wade, District Judge of the United States, sitting as Judge of the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska, before this Court, at the City of Washington, on Monday, March 14th, 1921, or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard, why the prayer of said petition should not be granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte in the Matter of Matthew Addy Steamship and Commerce Corporation, Petitioner, 30, Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte in the Matter of Matthew Addy Steamship and Commerce Corporation, Petitioner, 30, Original.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that cause be shown by Honorable Edmund Waddill, Jr., Judge of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia, before this Court at the city of Washington, on Monday, March 14th, 1921, or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard, why the prayer of said petition should not be granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Anchor Company, Appellant, 600 vs. The P. & M. Company.

On consideration of the motion for a writ of certiorari on suggestion of diminution of the record herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, the matter presented with the suggestion to stand as a return to the writ.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

New Bedford Dry Dock Company,
Appellant,
520 vs.
Blake G. Purdy, Claimant of the Steamer, "Jack-o-Lantern".

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied, but the case will be taken on printed briefs in counsel are so advised.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
523 vs.
Boze Yuginovich et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 28th next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Joseph A. Burdeau, Appellant,
646 vs.
J. C. McDowell,

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 28th, next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

David M. Goodrich, Plaintiff in error,
663 vs.
William H. Edwards, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of the State of New York.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 28th, next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
691 vs.
A. Z. Hutto, J. R. White, Ray See and J. R. Hicks;
and
The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error.

692 vs. A. Z. Hutto. — On consideration of the motion to advance these cases, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, April 11th, next.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Railroad Commission of Wisconsin et al., Appellants, 694 vs. Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad Company. — On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 28th next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Carlos Carmelo Garcia, Appellant, 648 vs. James B. Holohan, United States Marshal for the Northern District of California, et al. — On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

British Columbia Mills Tug & Barge Company, Petitioner, 664 vs. A. W. Milroie. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of ceritorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Great Northern Railway Company and John Barton Payne, Director General of Railroads, Petitioner, 686 vs. Merchants Elevator Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota and of the argument of counsel th-

upon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Commerce Trust Company, Petitioner,
671 vs.
Samuel Rusnak, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of Garden City Parlor Furniture Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

William M. Duncan, Receiver of the Wheeling & Lake Erie Railroad Company, Petitioner,
684 vs.
Horace P. Baker, Receiver of the Wabash-Pittsburgh Terminal Railway Company, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Virginia Trust Company et al., Executors, etc., Plaintiffs in error,
259 vs.
The Commonwealth of Virginia et al.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. D. Hank, Jr., and Mr. John R. Saunders, for the defendants in error in support of the motion and by Mr. John S. Barbour for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

Monday, January 31st, 1921, continued.

Doehler Die-Casting Company et al., Appellants, 668 vs. Brooklyn Union Gas Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Daniel Davenport in behalf of counsel for the appellants in support of the motion, and by Mr. William N. Dykman for the appellee in opposition thereto.

Ed Hagen et al., Petitioners, 677 vs. The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. A. H. Ferguson and Mr. John J. Sullivan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. Roy C. McHenry for the respondent.

Charles Wooster et al., Petitioners, 669 vs. Union Pacific Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. C. C. Flansburg and Mr. W. H. Thompson for the petitioners and by Mr. N. H. Loomis and Mr. C. A. Magaw for the respondent.

Jewel Carmen, Petitioner, 685 vs. Fox Film Corporation et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Nathan Burkan and Mr. William J. Hughes for the petitioner and by Mr. Saul E. Rogers for the respondent.

Eastman Kodak Company, a Corporation of New Jersey; Eastman Kodak Company, a corporation of New York; George Eastman et al., Appellants, 2 vs. The United States of America.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of New York.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellants to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Courtthat this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Petroleum Company of Louisiana, Appellant, 362 vs. L. A. Tumlin et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Louisiana and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Otto Mueller et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
305 vs.
Northern Pacific Railway Company.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles W. Bunn for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Dallas V. Halverstadt and Mr. L. C. Stevenson for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, February 28th, next, at 12 o'clock.

Monday, February 28th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Attorney General Palmer, it is ordered that Seiford K. Stellwagen, Esquire of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota; Leon P. Cooper, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia; Robert D. Bartlett, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland; J. Kemp Bartlett, Jr., Esquire, of Baltimore State of Maryland; Albert C. Hunt, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma; Wilford Hearn, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, E. B. Harrison, Esquire, of Blytheville, State of Arkansas; and R. Colton Lewis, Esquire, of Clifton, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson, it is ordered that John London, Esquire, of Birmingham, State of Alabama; Erle Pettus, Esquire of Birmingham, State of Alabama; Wallace Streater, Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia; George E. Kimball, Esquire of Boston, State of Massachusetts; Joseph A. Mahoney, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts; William J. Matthews, Esquire of Chicago, State of Illinois; Dale D. Drain, Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia; J. F. Aldine Chambers, Esquire of Atlanta, State of Georgia; Charles N. Willard, Esquire of Kinsley, State of Kansas; Andrew J. Aldridge, Esquire of Birmingham, State of Alabama; Harry B. Skillman, Esquire of Indianapolis, State of Indiana; J. B. Densmore, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harold K. Acker it it ordered that Mary E. Laird, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. Warner Parker it is ordered that Max G. Cohen, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motionfirst made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Levi H. David, it is ordered that Frank H. Haskell, Esquire, of Portland, State of Maine, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey, it is ordered that John C. Williams, Esquire of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. A. Denson, it is ordered that D. M. Powell, Esquire, of Greenville, State of Alabama be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, it is ordered that James D. Meredith, Esquire, of Sacramento, State of California; Ranson H. Gillett, Esquire, of Troy, State of New York; Charles S. Peery, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California and Edwin V. Guinan, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel M. Shortridge it is ordered that Harry Gottesfeld, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James O. Murfin it is ordered that Frederick A. Henry, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by H. M. Newlett it is ordered that Harry A. Clarke, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Archibald King it is ordered that James W. Carpenter, Esquire, of New Haven, State of Connecticut be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney it is ordered that Francis G. Hicho, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Milton C. Elliott it is ordered that Ewing R. Philbin, Esquire, and Clair B. Hughes, Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James F. Green, it is ordered that Henry S. Conrad, Esquire, of Kansas City and Thomas O. Stokes, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank W. McAllister it is ordered that Jesse W. Barrett, Esquire, of St. Louis State of Missouir, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Bernard Hirshkopf it is ordered that Samuel H. Gerstein, Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Enoch A. Chase, it is ordered that Frank C. Briggs, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Will H. King it

is ordered that Ralph E. Moody, Esquire, Thomas Henry Keogh, Esquire, and Richard T. Lynch, Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Bruce Scott it is ordered that Kenneth F. Burgess, Esquire of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fletcher Lewis it is ordered that E. Barrett Prettyman, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Sutherland, it is ordered that Preston D. Richards, Esquire of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. W. Woodman, it is ordered that John E. Benton, Esquire, of Keene, State of New Hampshire, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Felix Gouled,
250 vs.
The United States of America.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of appeals for the Second Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the first, second, third, fourth, fifth and sixth questions certified must be answered in the affirmative.

Whereupon, it is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Lawrence Amos, Plaintiff in error,
114 vs.
The United States of America.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of South Carolina.

Monday, February 28th, 1921, continued.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Union Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. James J. E. Burke. 183

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Ex parte In the Matter of Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner, 24, Original.

This cause came on to be heard on the petition for a writ of prohibition and / or a writ of mandamus and the return to the rule to show cause, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by the Court that said rule to show cause be discharged and that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis,

(Mr. Justice Day took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

Armour and Company and Armour and Company of Texas, Appellants, vs. The City of Dallas et al. 189

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on thetranscript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Texas, and

was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Charles I. Dawson, Attorney General of the State of Kentucky, Victor A. Bradley, Commonwealth's Attorney for the Fourteenth Judicial District of Kentucky, John I. Craig, Auditor of Public Accounts of the State of Kentucky. Appellants,
439 vs.
Kentucky Distilleries & Warehouse Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Charles I. Dawson, Attorney General of the State of Kentucky, Victor A. Bradley, Commonwealth's Attorney for the Fourteenth Judicial District of Kentucky, John I. Craig, Auditor of Public Accounts of the State of Kentucky. Appellants,
582 vs.
The J. & A. Freiberg Company, Inc.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The New Orleans Land Company, Appellant, vs. Leader Realty Company, Limited. 152

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Edward Rutledge Timber Company and Northern Pacific Railway Company, Appellants, vs. Alra G. Farrell. 172

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the District of Idaho in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Michael Maguire and C. S. Maguire, Plaintiffs in error, vs. Timothy A. Reardon et al., as Commissioners, constituting The Board of Public Works of the City and County of San Francisco, et al. 202

In error to the District Court of Appeal of the State of California in and for the First Appellate District Division One.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of Appeal of the State of California in and for the First Appellate District, Division One, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, [illegible]

Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeal in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The United States, Appellant,
442 vs.
Stanley Field, as Executor of the Estate of Kate Field, deceased.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

per Mr. Justice Pitney.

St. Louis Iron Mountain and Southern Railway Company and United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company, Appellants,
178 vs.
J. F. Hasty & Sons, Mount Olive Stave Company, Pulaski Cooperage Company, and the Henry Wrape Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Arkansas and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Pitney.

Giovanni Luzzato and Joseph G. Luzzato, Co-partners, Trading under the Firm Name of Giovanni Luzzato & Son, Appellants,
317 vs.
The Steamship "Pesaro" etc.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity withthe opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Giuseppe Cavallaro, Petitioner, vs. Steamship "Carlo Poma," Her Engines, etc. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second circuit.

167

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, vacated, the costs in this court to be paid by the petitioner; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals with direction to dismiss the appeal from the District Court.

per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Patrick H. Bodkin, Appellant, vs. William B. Edwards. — Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

495

This cause came on tobe heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California.

per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Charles L. Baender, Appellant, vs. Frank Barnett, as Sheriff of Alameda County, California. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

614

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

John Barton Payne, Secretary of the Interior, and Clay Tallman, Commissioner of the General Land Office, Appellants,
17 vs.
Central Pacific Railway Company.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, modified as indicated in the opinion of this Court and, as so modified, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Max W. Stoehr, Suing in his own behalf as a stockholder in Stoehr & Sons, Inc., and in behalf of all others similarly situated, Appellants,
546. vs.
James N. Wallace et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof it is now here ordered adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
147 vs.

William E. Rogers et al. In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of New Mexico.

per Mr. Justice Day.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

148 vs.

Margie L. Highsmith.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and was argued by Counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of New Mexico.

per Mr. Justice Day.

Detroit United Railway, Appellant, Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan.

492 vs.

City of Detroit et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Day.

Charles E. Smith, Appellant,

199 vs.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Day.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr. Justice McReynolds.

(Mr. Justice Brandeis took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

Silver King Coalition Mines Company, Petitioner,
158. vs.
Conkling Mining Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Utah for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

(The Chief Justice took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

Silver King Coalition Mines Company,
187 vs.
Conkling Mining Company.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby dismissed, for

the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

(The Chief Justice took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

Vandalia Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in error,
125. vs.
Gustav A. Schnull, William J. Griffin, and George C. Griffin, composing the firm of Schnull & Company et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not in consistent with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Day.
Mr. Justice Pitney.
Mr. Justice Brandeis.
Mr. Justice Clarke.

Postal Telegraph-Cable Company,
Plaintiff in error,
156 vs.
The City of Fremont.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Hartford Life Indurance Company,
Plaintiff in error,
161 vs.

Cecilia Blincoe, Administratrix of the Estate of Rosa Barber, deceased. — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the said is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Holmes.
Mr. Justice Van Devanter.
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in error, — In error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

143. vs.

L. C. Russell.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Lower Vein Coal Company, Appellant, — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Indiana.

186 vs.

Industrial Board of Indiana et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Indiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be and the same is here by, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

El Banco Popular de Economias y Prestamos de San Juan, P. R., Appellant, vs. Elias B. Wilcox. — Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

91.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

T. M. Duche & Sons, Limited, Petitioner, vs. American Schooner "John Twohy" her tackle, etc., Albert D. Cummins and Howard Compton, Claimants. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

84

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in error, vs. L. Cohen Grocery Company. — In error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri.

324

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this

Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

(Mr. Justice Pitney and Mr. Justice Brandeis concur in the result).

(Mr. Justice Day took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

Weeds, Inc., and Gurdon H. Smith, Plaintiffs in error,
558 vs.
The United States of America.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of New York and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court with directions to set aside the sentence and quash the indictment.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

(Mr. Justice Pitney and Mr. Justice Brandeis concur in the result).

(Mr. Justice Day took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

C. A. Weed & Company, Appellant,
407 vs.
Stephen T. Lockwood, as United States Attorney for the Western District of New York.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

(Mr. Justice Pitney and Mr. Justice Brandeis concur in the result).

(Mr. Justice Day took no part in the consideration and decision of this case).

John H. Kinnane, United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Michigan, Appellant,
376 vs.
Detroit Creamery Company et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

(Mr. Justice Pitney and Mr. Justice Brandeis concur in the result)
(Mr. Justice Day took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

The United States of America, Plaintiff in error,
377 vs.
Ben B. Swartz.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

(Mr. Justice Pitney and Mr. Justice Brandeis concur in the result).
(Mr. Justice Day took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

The United States of America, Plaintiff in error,
378. vs.
Jacob M. Smith.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

(Mr. Justice Pitney and Mr. Justice Brandeis concur in the result).
(Mr. Justice Day took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

Harry B. Tedrow, as United States District Attorney for the District of Colorado, Appellant,
357. vs.
A. T. Lewis & Son Dry Goods Company, The Denver Dry Goods Company et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Colorado.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Colorado and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

(Mr. Justice Pitney and Mr. Justice Brandeis concue in the result).
(Mr. Justice Day took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

R. E. Kennington, R. E. Kennington Company and Union Department Store, Appellants,
367. vs.
A. Mitchell Palmer, Attorney General et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Mississippi and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is here reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

(Mr. Justice Pitney and Mr. Justice Brandeis concur in the result).
(Mr. Justice Day took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

The G. S. Willard Company, Henry S. Barton, Perry P. Barton, and W. A. Duff, Appellants,
418 vs.
A. Mitchell Palmer, as Attorney General of the United States, and Edwin S. Wertz, as United States District Attorney for the Northern District of Ohio.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

(Mr. Justice Pitney and Mr. Justice Brandeis concur in the result).
(Mr. Justice Day took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause).

Oglesby Grocery Company,
457 Plaintiff in error,
vs
The United States of America.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed, [illegible], and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court with directions to set aside the sentence and quash the indictment.

per Mr. Chief Justice White,

(Mr. Justice Pitney and Mr. Justice Brandeis concur in the result.)
(Mr. Justice Day took no part in the consideration or decision of this Court).

Kenneth D. Strret, Appellant,
144 vs.
W. W. Beaty, F. D. Freeborn, Trustee, Doles Dolliver, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of North Carolina and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The DeLamar Company, Limited,
Plaintiff in error,
179 vs.
The United States of America.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Idaho.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Idaho, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is nowhere ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Missouri, Kansas and Texas Railway Company et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
198 vs.
Hannah L. Zuber.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Otto Mueller and Grace Mueller,
Plaintiffs in error,
305 vs.
Northern Pacific Railway Company.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington on motion to dismiss or affirm and argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Virginia Trust Company and John S. Barbour, Executors of the Last Will and Testament of John F. Rixey, deceased.
Plaintiffs in error,
259 vs.
The Commonwealth of Virginia and the Board of Supervisors of Culpeper County, Virginia.

In error to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

City of Hillsboro, Oregon.
Plaintiff in error,
618 vs.
Public Service Commission of Oregon et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed

for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Doehler Die-Casting Company, National Lead Company et al., Appellants, vs. Brooklyn Union Gas Company. 668

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ed Hagen et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 677

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Charles Wooster, Little M. Wooster and Charles Wooster, Jr., Petitioners, vs. Union Pacific Railroad Company. 659

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Jewel Carmen, Petitioner, vs. Fox Film Corporation et al. 685

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

American Column & Lumber Company et al., Appellants, 369 vs. The United States of America.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be restored to the docket for reargument.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Marie E. Scheurle, Administratrix etc., Petitioner, 711. vs. Onepiece Bifocal Lens Company.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, 23, Original. vs. The State of Texas.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Frierson, leave is granted to file response of the United States to the motions of the General Oil Company et al.

American Bank & Trust Company et al., Appellants, 679 vs. Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson and Mr. Hollins N. Randolph for the appellees in support of the motion and by Mr. Alex W. Smith for the appellants in opposition thereto.

Illinois Central Railroad Company, plaintiff in error, 620 vs. C. B. Johnson.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted by Mr. Augustus Denson for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Augustus Bonners, Mr. W. S. Horton, and Mr. R. V. Fletcher for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in error, 523 vs. Boze Yuginovich et al.

On motion of Mr. Wayne B. Wheeler in that behalf, leave is granted to file brief as amicus curiae in this cause.

James J. Walsh, Collector of Internal Revenue, Plaintiff in error, 742 vs. Frederick F. Brewster.

The motion to advance this cause for hearing after case No. 663, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Terry Mohun for the defendant in error.

Marcus Brown Holding Company, Inc., Appellant,
731. vs.
Marcus Feldman et al.
for the appellant.

The motion to advance this case for hearing after case No. 640 was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph A. Seidman

Ex parte in the Matter of Hussein Lutfi Bey, Master, etc., --Original. Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of prohibition and / or a writ of mandamus was submitted by Mr. John H. Woolsey and Mr. Frank J. Mcdonnell for the petitioner.

The National Order of Daughters of Isabella, Petitioner,
705 vs.
National Circle, Daughters of Isabella.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Abram J. Rose for the petitioner and by Mr. George D. Watrous for the respondent.

Cornelius C. Watts et al., petitioners,
389. vs.
Ely Real Estate & Investment Company.

The motion to dismiss for want of prosecution herein was submitted by Mr. E. W. Bradford in behalf of Mr. Selim Franklin for the respondent in support of the motion, and by Mr. S. L. Kingan, Mr. Herbert Noble and Mr. Hartwell P. Heath for the petitioners in opposition thereto.

Ex parte in the Matter of William Bradley et al.,
-- Original. Petitioners.

The motion for leave to file petition for writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Ralph E. Moody for the petitioners.

Railroad Commission of Wisconsin et al., Appellants,
694 vs.
Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad Company.

On motion of Mr. Charles W. Needham leave was granted to file brief for the Interstate Commerce Commission as amicus curiae in this cause.

The motion for leave to take part in the oral argument of this cause was submitted by Mr. Charles W. Needham for the Interstate Commerce Commission as amicus curiae.

Railroad Commission of Wisconsin, et al., Appellants, 694 vs. Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad Company.

On motion of Mr. John E. Benton, leave is granted to file brief on behalf of 43 States as amicus curiae in this cause. The motion for leave to take part in the oral argument of this cause was submitted by Mr. John E. Benton on behalf of 43 State as amicus curiae.

Western Union Telegraph Company, Petitioner, 491 vs. Esteve Brothers Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Paul E. Losh in behalf of counsel for the petitioner.

The State of Arkansas, Complainant, 6, Original. The State of Mississippi.

The motion for an order confirming the Report of the Commissioners in this cause was submitted by Mr. J. S. Utley, Mr. J. M. Moore, and Mr. Herbert Pope for the complainant, and by Mr. Marcellus Green, Mr. Gerald Fitzgerald, and Mr. Garner Wynn Green for the defendant.

Herbert Darlington, plaintiff in error, 716 vs. Harry W. Mager, Collector, etc.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Herbert Pope, Mr. Rush C. Butler, and Mr. James J. Forstall for the plaintiff in error.

Ex parte in the Matter of Thomas G. Moran, -- Original. Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file petition for writs of certiorari, prohibition and mandamus was submitted by Mr. A. Warner Parker in behalf of Mr. William J. Hennessey for the petitioner.

Ex Parte In the Matter of Henry O. Hollander, -- Original. Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file petition for writs of certiorari, prohibition and mandamus was submitted by Mr. A. Warner Parker in behalf of Mr. William J. Hennessey for the petitioner.

Alice Harn et al., Plaintiffs in error, 429 vs. Interstate Building & Loan Company et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted by Mr. Enoch A. Crane and Mr. W. P. Wilson for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. W. P. Harn, pro se, in opposition thereto.

The Egry Register Company, -- Original. Petitioner. The motion for leave to file petition in contempt was submitted by Mr. A. H. Gemmer in behalf of Mr. H. A. Toulmin, and Mr. H. A. Toulmin, Jr. for the petitioner.

The Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway, Petitioner, 656 vs. The United States of America. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Fitzgerald Hall for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson and Mr. Robert P. Frierson for the respondent.

Louise Marie Bailey Shannon et al. (heirs) etc., (et al), Petitioners, 678 vs. Gulf Production Company et al., etc. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Hed B. Morris, and Mr. W. W. Moore for the petitioners, and by Mr. H. M. Garwood, Mr. A. D. Lipscomb, Mr. Monte M. Lemann and Mr. J. Blanc Monroe for the respondents.

Mrs. Julia A. Whitehead, Petitioner, 682 vs. Railway Mail Association. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Robert Mayes for the petitioner and by Mr. William H. Watkins for the respondent.

George A. Gallicotte, Petitioner, 696 vs. Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. K. B. Randolph and Mr. Arthur L. Oliver for the petitioner, and by Mr. John E. Dolman for the respondent.

C. A. Barnett, petitioner, 697 vs. Roland R. Conklin. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. J. G. L. Harvey and Mr. James A. Reed for the petitioner and by Mr. Leslie J. Lyons for the respondent.

Carl H. Wright, petitioner, 701 vs. Inter-Urban Railway Company. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Samuel A. Anderson for the petitioner and by Mr. Horatio F. Dale for the respondent.

Bates County, Missouri, et al., Petitioners, 703 vs. A. V. Wills et al., partners, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Frank Hagerman for the petitioners and by Mr. John F. Green for the respondents.
The New York Central Railroad Company, Petitioner, 704 vs. Perfetti Cosmo.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Robert E. Whalen for the petitioner.
Hamilton Investment Company et al., Petitioners, 715 vs. Otto Bollman.	The petition for writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Henry J. Aaron for the petitioner and by Mr. Dwight S. Bobb for the respondent.
Samuel J. Masters et al., Petitioners, 717 vs. Charles A. Hartmann et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Wilton J. Lambert for the petitioners and by Mr. W. Gwynn Gardner for the respondents.
J. A. Calhoun, Sr., as Administrator, etc., Petitioner, 718 vs. Southern Railway Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. L. D. Jennings Mr. John H. Clifton, and Mr. A. S. Hardy for the petitioners and by Mr. S. H. Prince Mr. H. O'B. Cooper and Mr. F. C. Tompkins for the respondent.
Max Wagman, Petitioner, 719 vs. The United States of America.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. William E. Baubie for the petitioner.
Clifford D. Houk, petitioner, 721 vs. Charles V. Weddell et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted by Mr. Harry S. Mccartney for the petitioner and by Mr. Horace Kent Tenney, Mr. Roger Sherman and Mr. Harry A. Parkin for the respondents.
Churchward International Steel Company, Petitioner, 729 vs. Bethlehem Steel Company.	The petition for writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. F. P. Warfield and Mr. H. S. Duell for the petitioner and by Mr. Charles Neave, Mr. Joseph C. Fraley and Mr. Clarence D. Kerr for the respondent.

Carl E. Spicer, as Administrator, etc., Petitioner,
733 vs.
New York Life Insurance Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. S. H. Dent, Jr., and Mr. D. M. Powell for the petitioner and by Mr. James N. McClintock, Mr. Benjamin P. Crum and Mr. Leon Weil for the respondent.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company, Petitioner,
738 vs.
Joseph S. McIntyre, administrator, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. William F. Evans and Mr. Henry T. Miller for the petitioner and by Mr. Xenophon P. Wilfley and Mr. Robert W. Hall for the respondent.

The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner,
740 vs.
L. N. Arrington.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. J. M. Perry for the petitioner.

William D. Haywood et al., Petitioners,
760 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Otto Christenson for the petitioners.

Keokuk & Hamilton Bridge Company, Appellant,
512 vs.
Fred Salm, Jr., et al.,

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted by Mr. Earl W. Wood for the appellees in support of the motion and by Mr. Felix T. Hughes for the appellant in opposition thereto.

The United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company et al., Plaintiffs in error,
612 vs.
Travelers Insurance Machine Company.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted by Mr. David R. Castleman for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. William Marshall Bullitt for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

Oregon Short Line Railroad Company, Plaintiff in error,
255 vs.
Boise Commercial Club.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Joseph H. Burdeau, Appellant,
646, vs.
J. C. McDowell.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Frierson in that behalf, it is now here ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday, April 11th, next.

Ex Parte In the Matter of D. H. Riddle, Petitioner,
27, Original.

The argument on the return to the Rule to Show Cause in this cause was commenced by Mr. John London for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 11 o'clock.

Tuesday, March 1,1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day,

Willis Van Devanter,

Mahlon Pitney,

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

John H. Clarke,

Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court in opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Attorney General Palmer it is ordered that Joseph P. Tumulty, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson it is ordered that T. W. Sims, Esquire of ~~West~~ Linden, State of Tennessee be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Seldon P. Spencer, it is ordered that Marion C. Rhodes, Esquire, of Potosi, State of Missouri and L. L. Leonard, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hoke Smith, it it ordered that O. H. B. Bloodworth, Jr., Esquire, of Forsyth, State of Georgia and Samuel McGowan, Esquire, of Laurens, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David L. Podell it is ordered that Joseph A. Corr, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Isadore Stern it is ordered that Lionel Feller Schlesinger, Esquire of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank W. McAllister it is ordered that Samuel C. Major, Esquire, of Fayette, State of Missouri be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. M. J. White, it is ordered that W. L. Harding, Esquire of Sioux City, State of Iowa and I. A. Smith, Esquire of Independence, State of Missouri be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Will R. Wood it is ordered that A. M. Dunbar, Esquire, of East Chicago, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William D. Guthrie it is ordered that Caldwell Myers, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

James J. Walsh, Collector of Internal Revenue,
Plaintiff in error,
742 vs.
Frederick P. Brewster.

On consideration of the motion to advance this case for hearing after case No. 663, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Marcus Brown Holding Company, Inc.,
Appellant,
731 vs.
Marcus Feldman et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this case for hearing after case No. 640, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company,
Appellant.

346 vs.
Lorenzo D. Thompson, State Treasurer, etc., et al.

On motion of Mr. Thomas O. Stokes, in that behalf, leave is granted to file brief as amicus curiae in this cause.

The Seaboard Air Line Railway, Appellant,
62 vs.
The United States.

On motion of Mr. Benjamin Carter for the appellant, it is ordered that this case be assigned for argument on Monday, April, 11th, next.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
523 vs.
Bozo Yuginovich et al.

On motion of Mr. Frank B. Ebbert in that behalf, it is ordered that the appearance of Mr. Frank B. Ebbert be withdrawn from this cause.

Ex Parte, In the Matter of D. H. Riddle, Petitioner,
27, Original.

The argument on the return to the Rule to Show Cause in this cause was continued by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson and Mr. Arle Pettus for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Benjamin Carter for the petitioner.

The Missouri Pacific Railway Company,
Plaintiff in error,
265 vs.
McGrew Coal Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. E. J. White for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Edwin A. Krauthoff for the defendant in error.

Anna Lang, as administratrix, etc.,
Petitioner,
290 vs.
New York Central Railroad Company.

This cause was Argued by Mr. Hamilton Ward for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Maurice C. Spratt for the defendant in error.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
524 vs.
The Coronado Beach Company.
and
The United States of America,
Appellant,
525 vs.
The Coronado Beach Company.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Garnett for the plaintiff in error and appellant, and continued by Mr. P. P. Dunne for the defendant in error and appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, March 2d, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met todat atthe Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank M. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leslie C. Garnett, it is ordered that J. W. Ross, Esquire, of Jackson, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lee S. Overman, it is ordered that Joseph E. Alexander, Esquire, Winston-Salem, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom D. McKeown it is ordered that Roscoe Cox, Esquire, of Chandler, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David L. Podell, it is ordered that David Bernstein, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chauncey D. Snow it is ordered that Clarence C. Reed, Esquire, of Brockton, State of Massachusetts be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John T. Creighton it is ordered that A. D. Stevens, Esquire, of Springfield, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Henri Eunice Moncravie Van Tine, etc., et al., Appellants,
422 vs.
Luella Moncravie.
in support of the motion.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted by Mr. William A. Ayres in behalf of Mr. Alfred M. Jackson for the appellee

Marcus Brown Holding Company, Inc., Appellant,
731 vs.
Marcus Feldman et al.
this cause.

On motion of Mr. Lewis M. Isaacs in that behalf, it is ordered that leave be, and it is hereby, granted to file brief as amicus curiae in

The United States of America, Plaintiff in error,
524 vs.
The Coronado Beach Company;
and
The United States of America, Appellant,
525 vs.
The Coronado Beach Company.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. P. F. Dunne for the defendant in error and appellee and concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Garnett for the plaintiff in error and appellant.

William Hollis et al., Appellants,
397 vs.
Charles W. Kutz, etc., et al., Commissioners etc., et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Roscoe F. Walter for the appellants and by Mr. Ben S. Minor for Washington Gas Light Company, and by Mr. F. H. Stephens for the Public Utilities Commission.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company, Appellant,
636 vs.
Lorenzo D. Thompson, State Treasurer, etc.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Edward T. Miller for the appellant and continued by Mr. Henry S. Conrad for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow, at 12 o'clock.

Thursday, March 3d, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Daniel Davenport it is ordered that Frank M. Libby, Esquire, of Portland, State of Maine be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. Walton Moore it is ordered that Jerome F. Donovan, Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson it is ordered that Thomas Brennan, Esquire of Boston, State of Massachusetts be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom D. McKoown it is ordered that Charles Swindall, Esquire, of Woodward, and David I. Johnston, Esquire of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. M. M. Neely it is ordered that Fred S. Purnell, Esquire, of Attica, and Everett Sanders, Esquire of Terre Haute, State of Indiana, M. L. Goldin, Esquire of Mun , State of North Carolina and Francis Turalla, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. J. Abbaticchio it is ordered that Ernest R. Bell, Esquire, of Fairmont, State of West Virginia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George W. Sutton it is ordered that Charles L. Householder, Esquire, of Knoxville, State of Tennessee be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
23, Original. vs.
The State of Texas.

The motion to instruct the Receiver herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey for the defendant.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company, Appellant,
636 vs.
Lorenzo D. Thompson, State Treasurer, etc.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Henry S. Conrad for the appellant. Ten days were allowed counsel for the appellee to file an additional brief herein, and five days thereafter were allowed counsel for appellant to file answer thereto.

Julius Block, etc.,
Plaintiff in error,
640 vs.
Louis Hirsh.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Frierson, leave was granted to Mr. Henry H. Glassie to participate in the oral argument of this cause on behalf of the United States as amicus curiae.

This cause was argued by Mr. Jesse C. Adkins for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Henry H. Glassie for the United States as amicus curiae, by special leave of Court, and by Mr. William C. Johnson for the defendant in error.

Marcus Brown Holding Company,
Appellant,
731 vs.
Marcus Feldman et al.

On motion of Mr. William D. Guthrie leave was granted him to participate in the oral argument of this cause on behalf of the Attorney General of the State of New York as amicus curiae.

Three hours were allowed for the argument of this cause.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Joseph A. Goldman for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 11:30 o'clock.

Friday, March 4th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

The Chief Justice announced that the Court will take a recess to attend the Inauguration of the President of the United States.

The oath of office was administered to the Honorable Warren G. Harding as President of the United States by the Chief Justice, and the Court reconvened.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, March 7th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day,

Willis Van Devanter,

Mahlon Pitney,

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

John H. Clarke,

Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson it is ordered that Francis H. Dohlen, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. J. Hickey, it is ordered that Nathaniel N. Bernstein, Esquire, of Michigan City, State of Indiana be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sidney M. Ballou it is ordered that Royal D. Mead, Esquire, of Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. M. B. Olbrich, it is ordered that Ralph M. Hoyt, Esquire, of Madison, State of Wisconsin be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. B. Flannery it is ordered that N. Otis Rockwood, Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ashby Williams, it is ordered that Robert L. Henry, Jr., Esquire, of Washington, District of

Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leo A. Rogers, it is ordered that W. Frederick Davis, Jr., Esquire, of Woburn, State of Massachusetts be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Julius Henry Cohen it is ordered that John Holley Clark, Jr., Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles P. Ford, it is ordered that Frank Bernard Smith, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America ex rel Milwaukee Social Democrat Publishing Company, Plaintiff in error,
155 vs.
Albert S. Burleson, Postmaster General of the United States.

In error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, ~~which are taxed~~ as of January 10th, 1921.

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Brandeis.
Mr. Justice Holmes.

Arthur Clay Pierce, Henry Clay Pierce, and Pierce Investment Company, Appellants.
173 vs.
The United States of America.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, modified as indicated in the opinion of this Court, and, as so modified, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Wirt H. Winton, Administrator of the Estate of Charles F. Winton, deceased, et al., Appellants,

6 vs.

Jack Amos and others known as the Mississippi Choctaws;

J. S. Bounds, Attorney-in-fact for T. A. Bounds, Appellant;

7 vs.

Jack Amos and others known as the Mississippi Choctaws;

John London, Appellant,

8 vs.

Jack Amos and other known as the Mississippi Choctaws;

Walter S. Field and Madison M. Lindley, Appellants,

9 vs.

Jack Amos and others known as the Mississippi Choctaws;

J. J. Beckham, Appellant,

10 vs.

Jack Amos and others known as the Mississippi Choctaws;

William N. Vernon, Appellant,

11 vs.

Jack Amos and others known as the Mississippi Choctaws;

Katie A. Howe, Executrix of the Estate of Chester Howe, deceased, Appellant,

12 vs.

Jack Amos and others known as the Mississippi Choctaws.

Appeals from the Court of Claims.

These causes came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, on separate appeals, and were argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in these causes, as to the petitioners Wirt K. Winton, Administrator of the Estate of Charles F. Winton, deceased, and associates and assigns of the said Charles F. Winton, deceased, James M. Jones, Administrator of of the Estate of James M. Jones, deceased, and Robert L. Owen, in his own behalf, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Court of Claims for additional findings as specified in the opinion of this Court.

It is further ordered and adjudged that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, as to the other appellants in this Court be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

per Mr. Justice Pitney.

(Mr. Justice Van Devanter and Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of these cases).

John Barton Payne, Secretary of the Interior, and Clay Tallman, Commissioner of the General Land Office, Appellants,
128 vs.
The State of New Mexico.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, modified as indicated in the opinion of this Court, and, as so modified, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, mandate to issue as of October 6, 1920.

per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The Supreme Tribe of Ben-Hur, Appellant,
274 vs.
Aurelia J. Cauble et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Indiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Indiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Day.

The Oregon-Washington Railroad and Navigation Company, Appellant,

134 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

(Mr. Justice Pitney and Mr. Justice Clarke concur in the result.)

The Western Pacific Railroad Company, Appellant,

136 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

The United States

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

(Mr. Justice Pitney and Mr. Justice Clarke concur in the result).

The United States of America, Appellant,

87 vs. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

The Diamond Coal & Coke Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Wyoming with directions to set aside its decree of dismissal and to over-rule the motion to dismiss and for further proceedings inconformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Willis D. Williams and Azel Williams, Plaintiffs in error,
159 vs.
The United States of America.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Indiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Indiana and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Henri Maclee Moncravie Van Tine, now Harrison and A. W. Comstock, Guardian, etc.,
Appellants,
422 vs.
Luella Moncravie.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Alice Harn and W. F. Harn,
Plaintiffs in error,
419 vs.
Into State Building & Loan

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company and Maryland Casualty Company, Plaintiffs in error, vs. Travelers Insurance Machine Company. — In error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

612

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Illinois Central Railroad Company, Plaintiff in error, vs. C. B. Johnson. — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama.

620

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex Parte In the Matter of William Bradley, et al., Petitioners, --- Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex Parte In the Matter of
The Egry Register Company,
--- Orig. Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file petition in contempt herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Western Union Telegraph Company,
Petitioner,
491. vs.
Hotevo Brothers & Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 11th, next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

American Bank and Trust Company,
et al., Appellants,
679 vs.
Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta
et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 11th, next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Herbert Darlington,
Plaintiff in error,
716 vs.
Harry W. Mager, Collector of
Internal Revenue for the First
District of Illinois.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 11th, next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Railroad Commission of Wisconsin
et al., Appellants,
694 vs.
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Rail-

On consideration of the motion of the Interstate Commerce Commission for leave to participate by its counsel in the oral argument in this case, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Railroad Commission of Wisconsin et al., Appellants,
694 vs.
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Company.

On consideration of the motion on behalf of various States for leave to participate in the oral argument in this case, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, to the extent, only of permitting the movers to be heard orally by one counsel selected to represent them.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Cornelius C. Watts and Dabney C. T. Davis, Jr., Petitioners,
389 vs.
Ely Real Estate & Investment Company.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the motion to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari filed herein,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of prosecution.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Keokuk & Hamilton Bridge Company, Appellant,
512 vs.
Fred Salm et al.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway Petitioner,
656 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of, as against the same

it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Louise Marie Bailey Shannon et al., Heirs at Law of Angeline Louis Bailey Dolbear, deceased, et al., Petitioners,
678 vs.
Gulf Production Company et al., and Phoenix Development Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Mrs. Julia A. Whitehead, Petitioner,
682 vs.
Railway Mail Association.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ ofcertiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

George A. Callicotte, Petitioner,
696 vs.
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is here-

S. A. Barnett, Petitioner,	On petition for writ of certiorari
697 vs.	to the United States Circuit Court
Roland R. Conklin.	of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Carl H. Wright, Petitioner,	On petition for writ of certiorari
701 vs.	to the Supreme Court of the State of
Inter-Urban Railway Company.	Iowa.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Bates County, Missouri, and the	On petition for writ of certiorari
State of Missouri at the relation	to the United States Circuit Court
of Jesse W. Barrett, Attorney	of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.
General, Petitioners,	
703 vs.	
A. V. Wills, W. V. Wills and Emmet	
S. Wills, partners doing business as	
A. V. Wills & Sons.	

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The New York Central Railroad	On petition for writ of certiorari
Company, Petitioner,	to the Supreme Court, Appellate Divi-
704 vs.	sion, Third Judicial Department, of
Perfetti Gomo.	the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari

to the Supreme Court, Appellate Division, Third Judicial Department of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The National Order of the Daughters of Isabella, Petitioner, vs. National Circle, Daughters of Isabella. 705

On petition for writof certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Hamilton Investment Company and Evans Rees, Petitioners, vs. Otto Bollman. 715

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Samuel J. Masters et al., Petitioners, vs. Charles A. Hartmann et al. 717

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Max Wagman, Petitioner, — On petition for writ of certiorari
719 vs. — to the United States Circuit Court
The United States of America. — of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Clifford D. Houk, Petitioner, — On petition for writ of certiorari
721 vs. — to the United States Circuit Court
Charles V. Weddell et al. — of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Churchward International Steel Company, Petitioner, — On petition for writ of certiorari
729 vs. — to the United States Circuit Court
Bethlehem Steel Company. — of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Carl E. Spicer, as Administrator of the Estate of Noble N. Spicer, deceased, Petitioner, — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.
733 vs.
New York Life Insurance Company.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the

it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

St. Louis-San Francisco Rail-Way Company, Petitioner,
738 vs.
Joseph S. McIntyre, Administrator of the Estate of Walter Lee Clark, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner,
740 vs.
L. N. Arrington.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein tothe Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Hulett C. Merritt, Petitioner,
519 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the transcript of record heretofore filed to the petition to stand as a return to the writ. per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Hulett C. Merritt, Petitioner,
519 vs.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and Mr. Solicitor General Frierson, of counsel for the respondent, having filed a confession of error and moved the Court to reverse the judgment herein,

It is, therefore, in pursuance of said confession and motion, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California for further proceedings.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Railroad Commission of Wisconsin, et al., Appellants,
694 vs.
Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad Company.

On motion of Mr. Bruce Scott in that behalf, it is ordered that William J. Morgan, present Attorney General of the State of Wisconsin and George B. Clementson, present District Attorney of Grant County, State of Wisconsin be substituted in the place of John J. Blaine and Frank S. Meyer, former Attorney General and District Attorney, respectively, as parties appellants in this cause.

Mutual Life Insurance Company, of New York, Plaintiff in error,
712 vs.
Mary S. Liebing.

The petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause was submitted by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, Mr. S. W. Fordyce, Mr. John H. Holliday, Mr. Thomas W. White, Mr. W. H. Woodward, and Mr. Frederick L. Allen, for the plaintiffs in error in support of the petition, and by Mr. James J. O'Donohue for the defendant in error in opposition thereto,

Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California, Petitioner,
737 vs.
John Barton, as Agent, etc. respondent.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Warren H. Pillsbury for the petitioner, and by Mr. A. S. Halsted and Mr. Alexander Britton for the

Charles L. Killgore, petitioner,
700 vs.
H. W. Skinner.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. H. M. Garwood for the petitioner.

Phoenix Portland Cement Company, Petitioner,
713 vs.
Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. William Jay Turner for the petitioner and by Mr. H. B. Gill for the respondent.

Pinkbine Lumber Company, Petitioner,
727 vs.
Gulf & Ship Island Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. W. A. White for the petitioner and by Mr. B.M. Eaton for the respondent.

Thomas H. Watters, petitioner,
732 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. John Lee Webster and Mr. Frank H. Gaines for the petitioner, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. Ivey C. McHenry for the respondent.

The Texas Company, Petitioner,
734 vs.
The Commonwealth of Virginia.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Thomas H. Willcox and Mr. Herman Block for the petitioner.

Jose Tayas Sons Company, Petitioner,
749 vs.
The Pompeian Company.

The petition for writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. D. Roger Englar for the petitioner.

Dundee Petroleum Company, Petitioner,
754 vs.
E. P. Clay.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. W. A. Ledbetter and Mr. H. L. Stuart for the petitioner and by Mr. F. M. Riddle and Mr. M. C. Maitland for the respondent.

Walker D. Hines, Director General of Railroads et al., Petitioners,
775 vs.

H. H. Smith. The petition for writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. J. C. South, Mr. Edward J. White, and Mr. W. P. Waggener for the petitioner.

Southern Paper Company, Plaintiff in error, 551 vs. Stokes V. Robertson, State Revenue Agent, etc. The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George Butler for the defendant in error in support of the motion and by Mr. W. A. White for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Marcus Brown Holding Company, (Inc), Appellant, 731 vs. Marcus Feldman et al. The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. William D. Guthrie for the Attorney General of the State of New York as amicus curiae, by special leave of Court, by Mr. David L. Powell for the appellees and concluded by Mr. Joseph A. Seidman for the appellant.

United Shoe Machinery Corporation, et al., Appellants, 476 vs. The United States of America. Three hours were allowed each side for the oral argument of this case. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Charles F. Choate, Jr., for the appellants.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Tuesday, March 8th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day,

Willis Van Devanter

Mahlon Pitney,

James C. McReynolds,

John H. Clarke,

Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Earl C. Michener it is ordered that Thomas W. Thompson, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles F. Choate, Jr., it is ordered that Charles W. Blood, Esquire, of Newton, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

James J. Walsh, Collector, etc., Plaintiff in error,
742 vs.
Frederick F. Brewster.

On motion of Mr. H. Edgar Barnes, leave is hereby granted him to file brief as amicus curiae in this cause.

Everglades Sugar & Land Company et al., Plaintiffs in error,
203 vs.
Napoleon B. Broward Drainage District et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiffs in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

United Shoe Machinery Corporation, et al., Appellants, 476. vs. The United States of America.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Charles F. Choate, Jr., for the appellants, by Mr. La Rue Brown and Mr. Leo A. Rogers for the appellee, by Mr. Gordonio A. Severance for the appellants and by Mr. Elias Field for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, March 9th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank S. Bright it is ordered that Walter Norman Maguire, Esquire, of Stamford, State of Connecticut and Albert Woodruff Gray, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Symonds it is ordered that William M. Maulsbe, Esquire, of Newoka, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Mr. Solicitor General Frierson presented the Honorable Harry M. Daugherty as Attorney General of the United States, and it was ordered that his commission be recorded.

Which said Commission is in the words and figures following, viz:

WARREN G. HARDING

President of the United States of America.

To all who shall see these presents, GREETING:

KNOW YE, that reposing special trust and confidence in the Patriotism, Integrity and Abilities of HARRY M. DAUGHERTY, of OHIO, I have nominated, and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, do appoint him, Attorney General and do authorize and empower him to execute and fulfill the duties of that office according to law and to have and to hold the said office with all the powers, privileges and emoluments to the same of right appertaining unto him,

States, for the time being.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have caused these Letters to be made patent, and the seal of the United States to be hereunto affixed.

GIVEN UNDER MY HAND, in the District of Columbia, the fifth day of March, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and twenty-one, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty-fifth.

WARREN G. HARDING.

By the President:

CHARLES EVANS HUGHES

Secretary of State.

-oOo-

Railroad Commission of Wisconsin, et al., Appellants, vs. Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad Company. 694

On motion of Mr. Forney Johnston in that behalf, leave is hereby granted him to file brief as amicus curiae in this cause.

Ex Parte In the Matter of Matthew Addy Steamship and Commerce Corporation, Petitioner. 30, Original.

The motion for an injunction in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ashby Williams for the petitioner.

Czarnikow Rionda Company et al., Petitioners, vs. Binghampton Steamship Company et al. 785

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. John G. Milburn and Mr. George Whitefield Betts for the petitioner and by Mr. James M. Symmers and Mr. Edward E. Blodgett for the respondent.

David M. Simpson, Plaintiff in error, vs. The Board of Supervisors of Hassuth County, Iowa, et al. 204

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is now therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Wednesday, March 9th, 1921, continued.

United Shoe Machinery Corporation et al., Appellants,
476 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Elias Field for the appellee and concluded by Mr. Frederick P. Fish for the appellants.

Quong Ham Wah Company, Plaintiff in error,
638 vs.
Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Warren Gregory for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Warren H. Pillsbury for the defendant in error.

Miller and Lux (Inc)., Plaintiff in error,
347 vs.
The Sacramento and San Joaquin Drainage District.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Edward F. Treadwell for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson, it is ordered that Mark Hyman, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Swindall, it is ordered that John Charles Helms, Esquire of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry W. Van Dyke, it is ordered that Grahame H. Powell, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frans E. Lindquist it is ordered that John Alfred Anderson, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. C. Dodge it is ordered that William Ellsworth Tucker, Esquire of Boston, State of Massachusetts be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William D. Guthrie it is ordered that Glenn Willett, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

American Column and Lumber Company, et al.,
Appellants,
369 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Frierson it is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby assigned for re-argument on Monday, April 11th next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Albert Mennie, Plaintiff in error,
207 vs.
John W. Gibson.

This cause was passed on account of illness of counsel pursuant to the twenty-sixth rule.

Miller and Lux, (inc).,
Plaintiff in error,
347 vs.
The Sacramento and San Joaquin Drainage District.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Edward F. Treadwell for the plaintiff in error and concluded by Mr. Charles S. Peery for the defendant in error.

The United States of America,
plaintiff in error,
523 vs.
Boze Yuginovich et al.

This cause was argued by Mrs. Assistant Attorney General Adams for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Ransom H. Gillett for the defendants in error.

David M. Goodrich,
Plaintiff in error,
663 vs.
William H. Edwards, U. S. Collector of Internal Revenue;
and
James J. Walsh, Collector of Internal Revenue,
Plaintiff in error,
742 vs.
Frederick F. Brewster.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Frierson in that behalf, three hours were allowed for the argument of these cases. The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr. William D. Guthrie of counsel for the plaintiff in error in No. 663, and defendant in error in No. 742, and continued by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the defendant in error in No. 663 and the plaintiff in error in No. 742.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Friday, March 11th, 1921,

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day,

Willis Van Devanter,

Mahlon Pitney,

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

John H. Clarke,

Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Miles Poindexter it is ordered that Edward L. Corbett, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Levi Cooke it is ordered that Francis H. Gaskin, Jr., Esquire, of Danvers, State of Massachusetts to admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert G. Dodge it is ordered that Ralph A. Stewart, Esquire of Boston, State of Massachusetts be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

David M. Goodrich,
Plaintiff in error,
663 vs.
William H. Edwards, Collector,
etc., and
James J. Walsh, Collector, etc.,
plaintiff in error,
742 vs.
Frederick F. Brewster

On motion of Mr. Hoke Smith, leave is hereby granted him to file brief as amicus curiae in these cases.

The Choctaw, Oklahoma and Gulf Railroad Company et al., Appellants,
211 vs.
B. W. Mackey, as County Treasurer, etc., et al.

This cause was passed per stipulation of counsel, pursuant to the twenty-sixth Rule.

The Yazoo & Mississippi Valley Railroad Company et al., Petitioners,
216 vs.
Nichols & Company.

It is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed temporarily, pursuant to the twenty-sixth rule.

David M. Goodrich, Plaintiff in error,
663 vs.
William H. Edwards, Collector, etc., and
James J. Walsh, Collector, etc., plaintiff in error,
742 vs.
Frederick F. Brewster.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the defendant in error in No. 663 and the plaintiff in error in No. 742, and concluded by Mr. Henry F. Parmelee for the defendant in error in No. 742.

Railroad Commission of Wisconsin et al., Appellants,
694 vs.
Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad Company.

On motion of Mr. Alfred P. Thom in that behalf, nine hours were allowed for the oral argument of this cause. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. M. B. Olbrich for the appellants and continued by Mr. Bruce Scott for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, March 14th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Patrick H. Farrell it is ordered that Alfred H. McAdoo, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wells Goody-koontz it is ordered that Ira J. Partlow, Esquire, of Keystone, State of West Virginia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. F. H. Mother-shead it is ordered that John Edgar Hoover, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Addison T. Smith it is ordered that Charles Hershenstein, Esquire, of Jersey City, State of New Jersey be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Holdsworth Gordon it is ordered that Charles G. Robson, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. H. Carraway it is ordered that Frank S. Quinn, Esquire, of Texarkana, State of Arkansas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. White, Jr. it is ordered that Gilbert R. Swink, Esquire, of Norfolk, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward C. Griffin it is ordered that George L. Meade, Esquire, of Rochester, State of New York be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Garland S. Ferguson, Jr., it is ordered that William H. Pace, Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

John Barton Payne, Secretary of the Interior, and Clay Tallman, Commissioner of the General Land Office,

Plaintiffs in error,

123 vs.

The United States of America ex-rel. Allen L. Newton.

In error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, nunc pro tunc as of December 16, 1920.

per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Southern Paper Company,

Plaintiff in error,

581 vs.

Stokes V. Robertson, State Revenue Agent.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California, Petitioner,
737 vs.
John Barton Payne, as Agent, etc. (Los Angeles & Salt Lake Railway Company).

On petition for writ of certiorari to the District Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division No. 2, State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the District Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division No. 2, State of California and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

J. A. Calhoun, Sr., as Administrator, etc., Petitioner,
718 vs.
Southern Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Charles L. Killgore, Petitioner,
700 vs.
H. W. Skinner,

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is

now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Phoenix Portland Cement Company, Petitioner, vs. Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

713

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Pinkbine Lumber Company, Petitioner, vs. Gulf & Ship Island Railroad Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

727

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Texas Company, Petitioner, vs. The Commonwealth of Virginia. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

734

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Jose Tayan' Sons Company, Petitioner, vs.

748

The Pompeian Company. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Dundee Petroleum Company, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court
754 vs. of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.
R. P. Clay.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Czarnikow Rionda Company et al., Petitioners, On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court
765 vs. of appeals for the Second Circuit.
Binghamton Steamship Company.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

John S. Kendall, Administrator, etc., et al., Appellants, The motion to dismiss or affirm in
592 vs. this cause was submitted by Mr.
Paul A. Ewert. Henry C. Lewis for the appellee in support of the motion and by Mr. Arthur S. Thompson for the appellants in opposition thereto.

Southern Pacific Company, Petitioner,
743 vs.

John J. Thoman, Administrator, etc. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Charles H. Bates, Mr. Francis M. Hartman, Mr. William F. Herrin, and Mr. Henley C. Booth, for the petitioner, and by Mr. O. T. Richey for the respondent.

O. O. Askren, Attorney General of the State of New Mexico, et al., Appellants, vs. The Continental Oil Company. 695 — The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Patrick H. Loughran in that behalf.

William G. McAdoo, Director General of Railroads et al., Petitioners, vs. Neva M. McCoy, Administratrix, etc. 726 — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Alexander Britton, Mr. J. W. Terry, Mr. A. H. Culwell and Mr. Gardiner Lathrop for the petitioners, and by Mr. George H. Wallace and Mr. C. B. Hudspeth for the respondent.

John Barton Payne, Agent, etc., Petitioner, vs. Mrs. Virgie Mills, Administrator, etc. 744 — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. F. H. Prendergast for the petitioner and by Mr. Cone Johnson and Mr. James M. Edwards for the respondent.

North Carolina Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Evelyn K. Lee, Administratrix, &c. 758 — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. C. M. Prince, Mr. H. O'B. Cooper, Mr. John H. Wilson, and Mr. L. E. Jeffries for the petitioner, and by Mr. R. G. Strudwick for the respondent.

Edward Anderson et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States. 759 — The petition for writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Otto Christenson for the petitioners, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. Roy C. McHenry for the respondent.

John Barton Payne, as Agent, etc., Petitioner, vs. Katherine McL. Smith, Administratrix etc. 774

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. L. A. Manchester for the petitioner, and by Mr. D. F. Anderson for the respondent.

John Horstmann Company,
Appellant,
222 vs.
The United States.

This cause was continued per stipulation of counsel.

Railroad Commission of Wisconsin et al.,
Appellants,
694
Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad Company.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Bruce Scott for the appellee, by Mr. John E. Benton for 43 States as amicus curiae, by special leave of Court, and by Mr. Alfred P. Thom for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Tuesday, March 15th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John F. Miller it is ordered that Fred M. Lysons, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Peter F. Dunne, it is ordered that Herbert B. Clark, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Melville Church it is ordered that E. B. Tower, Jr., Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. B. Strang, it is ordered that Harry P. Andersen, Esquire, of Memphis, State of Tennessee be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry H. Snelling, it is ordered that Edward M. Evarts, Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick L. Fishback it is ordered that Roy St. Lewis, Esquire of Holdenville, State of Oklahoma be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and

Railroad Commission Commission of Wisconsin, et al., Appellants, vs. Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad Company.

694

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Alfred P. Thom for the appellee, by Mr. Patrick H. Farrell for the Interstate Commerce Commission as amicus curiae, by special leave of Court, and concluded by Mr. M. B. Olbrich for the appellants.

Ex Parte In the Matter of National Park Bank of New York, petitioner,

28, Original.

This cause was argued on the return to the rule to show cause by Mr. Edwin V. Guinan for the petitioner.

Ex Parte In the Matter of Lincoln Gas & Electric Light Company, Petitioner,

29, Original.

The argument of this cause on the return to the rule to show cause was commenced by Mr. Robert A. Brown for the petitioner and continued by Mr. C. Petrus Peterson for the City of Lincoln.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, March 16th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day,

Willis Van Devanter,

Mahlon Pitney,

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

John H. Clarke.

Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson it is ordered that Edwin L. Davis, Esquire, of Fulton, and Joseph W. Byrns, Esquire, of Nashville, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Nathan B. Williams it is ordered that Henry Heidelberg, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Gilbert P. Ritter it is ordered that Hobson D. Brown, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Gilbert P. Ritter it is ordered that Charles J. O'Neill, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hugh B. Rowland, it is ordered that C. Paul Talmadge, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

New York Trust Company et al.,

as Executors etc.,

286 vs. Mark Eisner.

On motion of Mr. J. E. Markham, in that behalf, leave is hereby granted him to file brief as amicus curiae in this cause.

Yee Won, Petitioner,
209 vs.
Edward D. White, Commissioner of Immigration, etc.

This cause was passed per stipulation of counsel, on motion of Mr. M. Walton Hendry in that behalf.

Ex Parte In the Matter of Lincoln Gas and Electric Light Company, Petitioner,
29, Original.

The argument on the return to the Rule to Show Cause in this case was concluded by Mr. C. Petrus Peterson for the petitioner.

Frey and Son, Incorporated,
Plaintiff in error,
200 vs.
The Cudahy Packing Company.
in error.

This cause was argued by Mr. Horace T. Smith and Mr. Charles Markell for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Gilbert H. Montague for the defendant in error.

Charlotte Harbor and Northern Railway Company,
Plaintiff in error,
208 vs.
W. C. Welles et al., etc.

This cause was submitted by Mr. James M. Gifford for the plaintiff in error. No appearance for the defendant in error.

The Kansas City Southern Railway Company et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
205 v3
Road Improvement District No. 6 of Little River County, Arkansas.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Samuel M. Moore for the plaintiffs in error, and continued by Mr. John J. DuLaney for the defendant in error and by Mr. James B. McDonough for the plaintiffs in error.

Preclusatim being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Thursday, March 17th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William W. Dodd, it is ordered that Arnold L. Guesmer, Esquire of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James W. Carmalt, it is ordered that George P. Graham, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James C. Cattle it is ordered that Charles H. Morganston, Jr., Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Norman Fischer, it it ordered that Robert M. McCormick, Esquire and Joseph P. Murray, Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles T. Bowler it is ordered that William Byrnes, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Newton K. Fox it is ordered that Roscoe H. Koch, Esquire, of Pottsville, State of Pennsylvania be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was

Kansas City Southern Railway Company et al., Plaintiffs in error,
215 vs.
Road Improvement District No. 6 of Little River County, Arkansas.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. James B. McDonough for the plaintiffs in error.

The Western Union Telegraph Company, Petitioner,
210. vs.
Eugene E. Southwick.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Rush Taggart, Mr. Francis Raymond Stark and Mr. Joseph L. Egan for the petitioner. No appearance was entered for the respondent.

Frank M. Hoy, Appellant,
212 vs.
Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior; and
The United States ex rel Edmund O. Wattis, Plaintiff in error,
213 vs.
Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior.

These cases were submitted by Mr. Harry A. Hegarty for the appellant and plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Garnet and Mr. H. L. Underwood for the appellee and defendant in error.

Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railway Company, Plaintiff in error,
142 vs.
Thomas M. Reynolds.

This cause was argued by Mr. Robert C. Dodge for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. William H. Tucker for the defendant in error.

Henry Friedman, Appellant,
221 vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. Charles A. Keigwin for the appellant and by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the appellee.

Norfolk-Southern Railroad Company, Petitioner,
223 vs.
M. M. Owens.

This cause was argued by Mr. W. B. Rodman, Jr., for the petitioner. No appearance was entered for the respondent.

The State of Minnesota on the relation of C. D. Whipple, Plaintiff in error,
224 vs.
Oscar Martinson, Sheriff, etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. Thomas T. Latimer for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. James E. Markham for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Friday, March 18th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Andrew Wilson it is ordered that Max J. Lapensky, Esquire, of Brownsville, State of Pennsylvania be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James J. O'Leary it is ordered that Hewitt Griggs Robertson, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson it is ordered that Charles E. Buchner, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
806 vs.
The Western Union Telegraph Co.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the appellant.

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York,
Appellants,
807 vs.
Consolidated Gas Company of New York.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Charles E. Buchner for the appellants.

John M. Anderson, plaintiff in error,
825 vs.

Peter W. Durr, as former Auditor, et al.	This [illegible] was [illegible] on account of the death of the plaintiff in error.
Western Fuel Company, 229 vs. Antonio Garcia, as Administrator, etc.	This cause was argued by Mr. Joseph F. Murray for the Western Fuel Company and by Mr. Henry Heidelberg for Garcia, as Administrator, etc.
The State of Washington ex rel McPherson Brothers Company, plaintiff in error, 231 vs. Douglas County et al.	This cause was submitted by Mr. Peter McPherson for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. L. L. Thompson for the defendant in error.
John P. Galbraith, Petitioner, 234 vs. John Wallely, Trustee, etc.	This cause was argued by Mr. Fred S. Dodge for the petitioner. No brief was filed for the respondent.
Dahnke-Walker Milling Company, Plaintiff in error, 235 vs. C. T. Bondurant.	This cause was argued by Mr. John C. Doolan for the plaintiff in error, and submitted by Mr. M. Walton Henry for the defendant in error.
C. H. Privett et al., Appellants, 236 vs. The United States of America et al.	This cause was argued by Mr. Preston C. West for the appellants and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Garnett for the appellees.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, March 21st, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day,

Willis Van Devanter,

Mahlon Pitney,

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

John H. Clarke.

Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

James. D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson, it is ordered that William E. Mayer, Esquire; Arthur C. Pickering, Esquire, and Mahlon C. Masterson, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia and Arthur B. Kiap, Esquire; Joseph Levy, Esquire and Aaron M. Becker, Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Bates, it is ordered that Edward M. Abbey, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in hits behalf by Mr. James Wickersham it is ordered that Cecil H. Clegg, Esquire of Fairbanks, Territory of Alaska, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Levi Cooke, it is ordered that Robert H. Otto, Esquire, of Jefferson City, State of Missouri be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Ex Parte In the Matter of D. H. Riddle, Petitioner,

27, Original.

This cause came on to be heard on the petition for a writ of mandamus and the return to the rule to show cause, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by the Court that said rule to show cause be discharged and that said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

William Hollis and Sam Goodman,
Appellants,
397 vs.
Charles W. Kutz; Louis Brownlow and W. Gwynn Gardiner, Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and as such constituting the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, and The Washington Gas Light Company.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Quong Ham Wah Company,
Plaintiff in error,
638 vs.
Industrial Accident Commission of California et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Missouri, Kansas and Texas
Railway Company,
Plaintiff in error,
142 vs.

In error to the Superior Court of the State of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Superior Court of the State of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and interest until paid at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the courts of the State of Massachusetts.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Western Union Telegraph Company,
Petitioner,
210 vs.
Eugene E. Southwick.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Seventh Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Civil Appeals for the Seventh Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Civil Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Civil Appeals for further proceedings.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The State of Washington, ex rel
McPherson Brothers Company,
Plaintiff in error,
231 vs.
Douglas County and Superior Court
of Chelan County, Washington.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

O. O. Askren, Attorney General
of the State of New Mexico et al.,
Appellants,

695 vs. The Continental Oil Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 11th, next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States of America, Appellant, 806 vs. The Western Union Telegraph Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 11th next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al etc., Appellants, 807 vs. Consolidated Gas Company of New York.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 10th, next.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

John G. Kendall, Administrator etc., et al., Appellants, 592 vs. Paul A. Ewort, hearing of the cause on the merits.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Charlotte Harbor and Northern Railway Company, Plaintiff in error, 201 vs. W. C. Welles et al., etc.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be restored to the docket for oral argument.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Western Fuel Company, 229 vs. Antonio Garcia, as Administrator etc. record and cause.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be restored to the docket for reargument, and that a writ of certiorari issue to bring up the entire re-

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

North Carolina Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
758 vs.
Evelyn K. Lee, Administratrix etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

On consideration of the petition for writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Thomas H. Watters,
Petitioner,
732 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Walker D. Hines, Director General of Railroads et al.,
Petitioners,
778 vs.
T. W. Leith.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

William G. McAdoo, Director General of Railroads et al., Petitioners,
726 vs.
Nova M. McCoy, Administratrix etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Eighth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Eighth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well, in support of as

Southern Pacific Company, Petitioner, vs. John J. Thomas, Administrator etc. 745

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

John Barton Payne, Agent, etc., Petitioner, vs. Mrs. Virgie Mills, Administratrix, etc. 744

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Sixth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Sixth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Edward Anderson et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 759

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Chief Justice announced that there will no no session of the

Court on Friday, the 25th instant, that day being Good Friday.

The Chief Justice announced that the Court will take a recess from Monday the 28th, instant to Monday, April 11th, next.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
276 vs.
Francis Fay, alias Fay Yong.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson, of counsel for the appellant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
277 vs.
William Chan, alias William Shan.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson, of counsel for the appellant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States,
Appellant,
810 vs.
C. W. Phelis.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the appellant.

The United States, Appellant,
811 vs.
Alan H. Woodward et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the appellant.

Charles Corneli, Appellant,
832 vs.
George H. Moore, Collector, etc.

George H. Ohio, Appellant,
633 vs.
George H. Moore, Collector, etc.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler in behalf of counsel for the appellants.

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
23, Original. vs.
The State of Texas.

The motion on behalf of A. E. Pearson and others for leave to intervene was submitted by Mr. W. B. Jaynes in that behalf.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railroad Company, Appellant,
636 vs.
Lorenzo D. Thompson, State Treasurer, etc., et al.

On motion of Mr. Robert W. Otto in that behalf, leave is hereby granted him to file reply brief for the appellee.

Ernest B. Dane, Plaintiff in error
264 vs.
Charles L. Burrill;

Ernest B. Dane, Plaintiff in error
509 vs.
Fred J. Burrill; Treasurer, etc.;
and
Ernest B. Dane, plaintiff in error,
7[illegible] vs.
James Jackson, Treasurer, etc.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., in that behalf.

Boston and Maine Railroad,
Petitioner,
751 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Archibald Tisdale and Mr. George E. Kimball for the petitioner, and by [illegible] Assistant Attorney General Adams for the respondent.

Jesse G. Darrow, Petitioner,
777 vs.
The Postal Telegraph-Cable Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Paul J. Sherwood for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry A. Knapp for the respondent.

Mike Blancett, Appellant,
244 vs.
Oscar Cardin, as Guardian, etc.

This cause was passed per stipulation of counsel under the 26th Rule.

N. W. Palmer, et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
245. vs.
Racheal King et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record with leave to counsel for both sides to file briefs within twenty days.

Natron Soda Company, Appellant,
247. vs.
The United States.

This cause was continued per stipulation of counsel.

Charles W. Steene, Frank L. Preston and William Hoetz,
Plaintiffs in error,
249 vs.
The United States of America.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of New York, and Mr. Solicitor General Frierson, of counsel for the defendant in error, having filed a confession of error and moved the Court to reverse the judgment herein,

It is therefore, in pursuance of said confession and motion, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings.

Sarah Mary Wall, Administratrix, etc., Plaintiff in error,
237 vs.
Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Co.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.
This cause was argued by Mr. C. Paul Tallmadge for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Worth S. Caylor for the defendant in error.

Bank of Minden et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
238 vs.
Mrs. Louie Clement, Administratrix, &c.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. B. Wilkinson for the defendant in error. No brief was filed for the plaintiffs in error.

The Merchants' National Bank of Richmond, Virginia,
Plaintiff in error,
240 vs.
The City of Richmond.

This cause was argued by Mr. Leon A. Ames for the plaintiff in error, and submitted by Mr. H. R. Pollard and Mr. George Hayne Anderson for the defendant in error.

Hiram Chase, Jr., a minor, etc.,
Appellant,
242 vs.
The United States of America;
and
Mary Gilpin, a minor, etc.,
Appellant,
243 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. Assistant Attorney General Garnett in that behalf, leave is granted counsel for the Omaha Indians to participate in the oral argument of these cases.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. John Lee Webster for the appellant and continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Garnett for the appellee, and by Mr. O. C. Anderson for the Omaha Tribe of Indians, by special leave of Court.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day,

Willis Van Devanter,

Mahlon Pitney

Associate Justices.

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

John H. Clarke,

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson, it is ordered that Henry H. Babcock, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, and Joseph V. Botterelli, Esquire of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. B. Norkam it is ordered that Halsey Sayles, Esquire, of Elmira, State of New York be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Watson it is ordered that J. Fred Schaffer, Esquire, of Sunbury, State od Pennsylvania be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leslie C. Garnett it is ordered that Franklin Chappell, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Marion E. Rhodes it is ordered that John D. Rippey, Esquire of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Tuesday, March 22d, 1921, continued.

Charles W. Anderson, Collector, etc., Petitioner, 783 vs. New York Life Insurance Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson and Mrs. Assistant Attorney General Adams for the petitioner.
John Gilmore, Petitioner, 745 vs. The United States of America.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. George E. Wallace for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. W. C. Herron for the respondent.
Bethelehem Motors Corporation et al., Plaintiffs in error, 254 vs. George W. Flynt, Sheriff, etc., et al.	This cause was submitted by Mr. J. A. Alexander for the plaintiffs in error and by Mr. James S. Manning for the defendants in error.
The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company, Appellant, 256 vs. The United States.	This cause was submitted by Mr. Alexander Britton and Mr. Gardiner Lathrop for the appellant and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Davis for the appellee.
Hiram Chase, Jr., a minor, etc., Appellant, 242 vs. The United States of America, and Mary Gilpin, a minor, etc., Appellant, 243 vs. The United States of America.	The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. O. C. Anderson for the Omaha Tribe of Indians, by special leave of Court and concluded by Mr. John Lee Webster for the Appellants.
The United States of America, Plaintiff in error, 246 vs. Charles C. A. Pftsch.	This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Davis for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Arthur B. King for the defendant in error.
J. J. Dillon, Appellant, 251 vs. R. W. Gloss, Deputy Collector, etc.	This cause was argued by Mr. Levi Cooke for the appellant and by Mrs. Assistant Attorney General Adams for the appellee.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in error,
251 vs.
H. A. F. Ault.

The cause was argued by Mr. Robert E. Wiley for the plaintiff in error and submitted by Mr. Frank Pace for the defendant in error.

The United States, Appellant,
253 vs.
L. P. and J. A. Smith.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Davis for the appellant and continued by Mr. John T. Morley for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, March 23d, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day,

Willis Van Devanter,

Mahlon Pitney

James C. McReynolds,

Louid D. Brandeis,

John H. Clarke,

Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Neave it is ordered that Frank C. Curtis, Esquire of Troy, State of New York be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made tothe Court in this behalf by Mr. Chapin Brown it is ordered that Chapin B. Penman, Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made th the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas C. Rutledge it is ordered that Earl F. Nelson, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William C. Prentiss it is ordered that Leonard B. Fowler, Esquire, of Carson City, State of Nevada be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward Schoen it is ordered that Maurice Cohn, Esquire of Paterson, State of New Jersey be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph S. Clark it

is ordered that Percy H. Clark, Esquire and Paul C. Wagner, Esquire of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

J. LeRoy Nickel et al., etc., et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
268 vs.
George A. Cole, as State Controller of State of Nevada;
Mollie Miller Nickel et al., etc., et al.
Plaintiffs in error,
269 vs.
The State of Nevada.

On motion of Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, in that behalf, leave is hereby granted him to file brief as amicus curiae in these cases.

The National Surety Company,
Appellant,
258 vs.
The County of Leflore in the State of Mississippi.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Mississippi.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ernest B. Dane,
Plaintiff in error,
264 vs.
Charles L. Burrill.

It is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed temporarily pursuant to the 26th Rule.

The United States, Appellant,
253 vs.
L. P. & J. A. Smith.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. John A. Morley for the appellees and concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Davis for the appellant.

Harry Krichman, Petitioner,
260 vs.

The United States of America. This cause was argued by Mr. Edward [illegible] for the petitioner and by Mr. W. C. Reeves for the respondent. Leave was granted to counsel for the petitioner to file reply brief within two weeks.

The St. Louis and East St. Louis Electric Railway Company, Plaintiff in error, vs. The State of Missouri at the relation and to the use of James Hagerman, Jr., Collector, etc. 261. This cause was argued by Mr. Joseph D. Clark for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Thomas C. Rutledge for the defendant in error.

City of San Antonio et al., Appellants, vs. San Antonio Public Service Company. 265 The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. R. J. McMillan for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until [illegible] at 12 o'clock.

Thursday, March 24th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day,

Willis Van Devanter,

Mahlon Pitney,

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

John H. Clarke,

Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. D. P. Wolhaupter it is ordered that James A. Donovan, Esquire of Lawrence, State of Massachusetts be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. M. C. Elliott it is ordered that Walter S. Logan, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. B. Fleharty it is ordered that Richard E. Harvey, Esquire of Portland, State of Maine be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. W. Harreld it is ordered that George A. Henshaw, Esquire of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Peter Goelet Gerry it is ordered that Frank L. Hunley, Esquire of Providence, State of Rhode Island be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Bank of Minden et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
238 vs.
Mrs. Louie Clement, Administratrix, etc.

On motion of Mr. [illegible] on behalf, leave is granted to file brief for the plaintiff in error in this cause.

Ernest D. Dane, plaintiff in error,
264 vs.
Marion L. Parrill.

It appearing to the Court [illegible] tive parties to dismiss the writ of error herein, [illegible] adjudged by this Court that the writ of error herein be and the same is hereby dismissed without costs to either party.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

City of San Antonio et al.,
Appellants,
263 vs.
San Antonio Public Service Company.
Appellee.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. H. J. McMillan for the appellants, continued by Mr. S. J. Brooks for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. H. J. McMillan for the appellants.

J. LeRoy Nickel et al., as Trustees, etc., et al.
Plaintiffs in error,
268 vs.
George A. Bole, as State Controller, etc.; and
Nellie Miller Nickel et al Trustees, etc., et al.,
plaintiffs in error,
269 vs.
The State of Nevada.

These causes were argued by Mr. Thomas J. Treadwell for the plaintiffs in error and by Mr. Leonard B. Fowler for the defendants in error.

The Vicksburg, Shreveport & Pacific Railway Company et al.,
Plaintiff in error,
271 vs.
[illegible]

The case was argued by Mr. S. H. Morro for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Harry L. Anderson for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, March 14th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day,

Willis Van Devanter,

Mahlon Pitney,

Louis D. Brandeis,

John H. Clarke,

Frank H. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson it is ordered that James C. Hemmer, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois and C. A. Summers, Esquire, of Kentucky, State of Kentucky be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick D. Tyler it is ordered that W. J. Rutledge, Jr., Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, and Bruce L. Casteel, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Levi Cooke, it is ordered that Walter H. Maune, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chauncey I. Holcomb, it is ordered that Roland S. Haskell, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sol M. Stroock it is ordered that George P. Brauburger, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Will R. Wood it is ordered that Fred Barnett, Esquire of Hammond, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leslie C. Garnett it is ordered that Cato Sells, Esquire, of Cleburne, State of Texas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

The Merchants' Loan and Trust Company, as Trustee of the Estate of Arthur Ryerson, deceased, plaintiff in error,
608 vs.
Julius F. Smietanka, formerly United States Collector of Internal Revenue for the first District of the State of Illinois.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Clarke,

(Mr. Justice Holmes and Mr. Justice Brandeis, because of prior decisions of the Court, concur only in the judgment.)

Eldorado Coal and Mining Company, Plaintiff in error,
609 vs.
Harry W. Mager, Collector of Internal Revenue for the First District of Illinois.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

(Mr. Justice Holmes and Mr. Justice Brandeis, because of prior decisions of this Court concur only in the judgment).

David M. Goodrich, Plaintiff in error, vs. William H. Edwards, United States Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of the State of New York. — In error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

663

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed in part and affirmed in part, each party to pay his own costs in this Court; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

(Mr. Justice Holmes and Mr. Justice Brandeis, because of prior decisions of the Court, concur only in the judgment).

James J. Walsh, Collector of Internal Revenue, Plaintiff in error, vs. Frederick F. Brewster. — In error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Connecticut.

742

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Connecticut, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed in part and affirmed in part, each party to pay his own costs in this Court; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

(Mr. Justice Holmes and Mr. Justice Brandeis, because of prior decisions of the Court, concur only in the judgment).

The State of Wyoming, H. S. Ridgely and The Midwest Refining Company, Appellants, vs. The United States of America. 257

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed, and that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the District of Wyoming in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court.

per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in error, vs. The Coronado Beach Company. 514

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California and was argued by counsel.

On consideration, whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

(Mr. Justice Clarke took no part in the decision of this case).

The United States of America, Appellant, vs. The Coronado Beach Company. 525

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be and the same is hereby, affirmed.

(Mr. Justice Clarke took no part in the decision of this case.)

Anna Lang, as Administratrix etc., of Oscar G. Lang, deceased, Petitioner,

290 vs.

New York Central Railroad Company.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Clarke,

Mr. Justice Day.

Henry Friedman, Appellant,

291 vs.

The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

(Mr. Justice Clarke took no part in the consideration and decision of this case).

Frank M. Hoy, Appellant,

312 vs.

Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was submitted on printed briefs by counsel on a suggestion that the cause had abated by reason of the death of the appellee.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for want of jurisdiction.

The United States of America, ex rel. Edmund O. Waltic, Plaintiff in error, 213 vs. Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior.

In error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was submitted by counsel on a suggestion that the case had abated by reason of the resignation of the defendant in error.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The State of Minnesota, Complainant, 13, Original. vs. The State of Wisconsin.

It is ordered that the time fixed for filing the Report of the Commissioners appointed to run and mark the boundary line between the respective states is extended from May 1st, to July 1st, 1921..

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ernest B. Dane, Plaintiff in error, 509 vs. Fred J. Burrill, Treasurer and Receiver General of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

and

Ernest B. Dane, Plaintiff in error, 510 vs. James Jackson, Treasurer and Receiver General.

On consideration of the motion to advance these causes, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, April 11th next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States, Appellant, 811 vs. Alan H. Woodward, Oscar W. Underwood and Reginald H. Bannister as Executors of Joseph A. Woodward, deceased

Monday, October 16th, 1922, continued.

Charles Worrall, Appellant,
vs.
George R. Lunn, Collector of
Internal Revenue;
Edwin J. Cole, Appellant,
vs.
George R. Lunn, Collector of
Internal Revenue.

No. 1. Submitted.

The United States, Appellant,
vs.
C. H. Hallin.

No. 2. Submitted.

Mutual Life Insurance Company
of New York,
Plaintiff in error,
vs.
Mary A. Liebing.

No. 3. Submitted.

Charles H. Ammerman, Collector of
Internal Revenue, Second District
of New York, Petitioner,
vs.
New York Life Insurance Company.

No. 4. Submitted.

John Barton Payne, Agent under designation of the President of the United States, petitioner,
774 vs.
Katherine McL. Smith, Administratrix of the Estate of George J. Smith, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

John Gilmore, Petitioner,
745 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Boston and Maine Railroad Petitioner,
751 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Jessie G. Darrow, Petitioner,
777 vs.
The Postal Telegraph-Cable Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had in behalf of petitioner and of respondent, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

No. 410. Writ of certiorari denied.

Chittenden Trading Company, Incorporated, Appellant, 410 vs. Stephen T. Lockwood, as United States Attorney for the Western District of New York.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York, and Mr. Solicitor General Beck, of counsel for the appellee, having filed a confession of error and moved the Court to enter a decree reversing the decree of the said District Court in this cause, and the Court being now fully advised in the premises,

It is therefore, in pursuance of said confession of error, ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings.

No. 411. Writ of certiorari denied.

Penna. Steamship Company, Plaintiff in error, 411 vs. The United States of America.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and Mr. Solicitor General Beck, of counsel for the defendant in error, having filed a confession of error and moved the Court to enter a decree reversing the judgment in this cause,

It is, therefore, in pursuance of said confession of error, ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings.

No. 412. Writ of certiorari denied.

The United States of America, plaintiff in error, vs. Peoples Fuel & Food Company. 379

In error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Arizona.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same [illegible].

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States of America, plaintiff in error, vs. [illegible] Woolen Company et al. 486

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States of America, plaintiff in error, vs. Brooklyn Edison Company, Inc., Adelphia Coal Company, Inc., Walter F. Wells, and Harry P. Reid. 688

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
vs.
Twenty-Mile Coal Co.

Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Illinois.

Statement of the case.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
vs.
Twenty-Mile Coal Co., Inc.,
and Walter P. Wells.

Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Illinois.

Statement of the case.

In Error to the matter of
The United States, owner of
the American Steamship "Western Gulf", petitioner.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Illinois.

In parts in the matter of the
United States, former registered
or chartered owner of the Auxiliary Steamer "Liberty", petitioner.

In parts in the matter of the
United States, former registered
or chartered owner of the Auxiliary

The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of prohibition and / or a petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Fahy for the petitioner.

Auditors Contracting Company, Inc., et al., Petitioners,
776 vs.
Foreign Trade Banking Corporation.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Fahy in that behalf, leave is granted to file brief as amicus curiae in this cause.

Pennsylvania Railroad Company, plaintiff in error,
706 vs.
Isaac C. Kober, Surviving partner, etc.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. William A. Glasgow, Jr., for the defendant in error.

Ellsworth H. Green, et al., petitioners,
763 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Samuel Herrick, Mr. Ed. S. Vaught, Mr. John B. Dudley for the petitioner, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Arenio J. McLaren, Administrator, etc., Petitioner,
891. vs.
L. G. Fleischer;
Robert L. Culpeper, Petitioner,
892 vs.
James M. Ocheltree.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted by Mr. Patrick H. Loughran for the respondents.

J. B. Flowers et al., Petitioners,
752 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. W. F. Weeks and Mr. C. C. McDonald for the petitioners.

Wagner Electric Manufacturing Company, petitioner,
754 vs.
Lamar Lyndon.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Charles A. Houts for the petitioner and by Mr. Lawrence C. Kingsland and Mr. JohnD. Rippey for the respondent.

The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Company, petitioner,
765 vs.
David Pruchter, an infant, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. James H. Carpenter for the petitioner and by Mr. Isaac Pruchter for the respondent.

The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Company, petitioner,
767 vs.
Ida Pruchter.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Joe [illegible] Carpenter for the petitioner and by Mr. Isaac Pruchter for the respondent.

Mary Flack, administratrix, etc., petitioner,
769 vs.
The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Joseph A. [illegible] and Mr. Oscar L. Hill for the petitioner.

Charles O'Connor et al., petitioners,
771 vs.
Fred Silliman, acting administrator, etc., et al.

The petition for writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. James C. Edmonds for the petitioners and by Mr. Owen D. Lipscomb, Jr. F.

John Martinkapp, et ux., petitioner,
777 vs.
Matthew Foley.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. [illegible] and Mr. Francis X. Riley for the petitioners, and by Mr. Herbert G. Harvey for the respondent.

Builders Contracting Company, Inc., et al., petitioners,
779 vs.
Foreign Trade Banking Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Albert J. Rosenthal for the petitioners and by Mr. Robert H. Richards for the respondent.

J. Olney Smith, petitioner,
787 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Fred Lee Hechler for the petitioner, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. [illegible] for the respondent.

Stanley C. Thompson, petitioner,

The United States of America. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. John Lee Webster for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. Roy C. McHenry for the respondent.

Clyde A. Smith, petitioner, The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. 789 vs. John Lee Webster for the petitioner The United States of America. and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. Roy C. McHenry for the respondent.

Edward A. Cheid et al., Petitioners, The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the 825 vs. Court by Mr. Fred Barnett for the The Calumet Construction Company. petitioners.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, April 11th next at 12 o'clock.

OCTOBER TERM, 1912.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day,

Willis Van Devanter,

Mahlon Pitney,

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

John H. Clarke,

Frank B. Brown, Esquire, Assistant,

Joseph H. Baker, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion of [illegible] to the Court in this behalf of Mr. [illegible] Esquire, Attorney General of the United States, it is ordered that S. J. Quinn, Esquire, of Birmingham, State of Alabama; Thomas A. Boyle, Esquire, and Clarence E. Boyle, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts; E. Lowry Humes, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania; Thornton F. Brooks, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, and J. Sentell, of Montgomery, State of Alabama and Samuel Shelton, Esquire, of Jacksonville, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were severally admitted accordingly.

On motion of Mr. [illegible] to the Court is admitted by Mr. William J. Campbell it is ordered that Everett M. Barnes, Esquire, of Albion, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was severally accordingly.

On motion duly made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Hunter, Jr., it is ordered that Joseph C. Breitenstein, Esq., of Cleveland State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was severally accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel Herrick it is ordered that Floyd E. Pendell, Esquire, of Casper, State of Wyoming, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motionfirst made to the Court in this behalf be Mr. Charles Swindall it is ordered that Sam K. Sullivan, Esquire, of Newkirk, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William G. Henderson it is ordered that Frank M. Donnett, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. C. Sullivan it is ordered that James Washington Cutshaw, Esquire of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney it is ordered that John M. M. Ewing, Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carrot W. McKenney, it is ordered that Vincent E. Butler, Jr., Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California be admitted to practive as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph Millerson it is ordered that Ellis Rosenberg, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Donovan it is ordered that Kennedy M. Thompson, Esquire, of New York City; and Edmund L. Jones, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edgar Bronson Tolman it is ordered that June C. Smith, Esquire, of Centralia and E. Bentley Hamilton, Esquire, of Peoria, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander S. Stewart it is ordered that Robert D. Eggleston, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counseller of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jackson H. Ralston it is ordered that John C. Benson, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota be admitted to practice as an attorney and counseller of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Daniel Thew Wright it is ordered that Adam E. Stricker, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counseller of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis W. Clements it is ordered that Elmer D. Means, Esquire, of Stigler, State of Oklahoma and Clay Tallman, Esquire of Tonopah, State of Nevada. Be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. R. Shearer it is ordered that Leon T. Seawell, Esquire of Norfolk, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counseller of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. P. Fennell it is ordered that Aubrey B. Fennell, Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counseller of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Andrew Wilson it is ordered that James L. Nesbitt, Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counseller of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., it is ordered that Daniel L. Brown, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas Wyatt Gregory it is ordered that Tom L. Beauchamp, Esquire of Paris, State of Texas, and Daniel Upthegrove, Esquire of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

Ex parte In the Matter of National Park Bank of New York, 28, Original. Petitioner.

This cause came on to be heard on the petition for a writ of mandamus and the return to the rule to show cause, and was argued by counsel,

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said rule to show cause be discharged and that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The Missouri Pacific Railway Company, Plaintiff in error, 265 vs. McGrew Coal Company.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

SarahMary Wall, Administratrix of the Estate of Edward Wall, deceased, plaintiff in error, 237 vs. Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Bank of Minden, Bank of Webster, and Robert Roberts, Jr.,
Plaintiffs in error,
238 vs.
Mrs. Louie Clement, Administratrix of the Succession of O. P. Clement, deceased.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Clarke.

Miller and Lux, Incorporated,
Plaintiff in error,
347 vs.
The Sacramento and San Joaquin Drainage District.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
23, Original vs.
The State of Texas.

Mr. Justice Pitney delivered the opinion of the Court in this case and counsel were directed to prepare and submit a form of decree herein within thirty days from this date.

James A. Owenby, plaintiff in error,
99 vs.

Hamilton, Herbert L. Satterlee, and Lewis C. Ledyard, as Executors of the Estate of John Pierpont Morgan, deceased. — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Delaware.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Delaware, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Pitney.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds concurs in the result).

(The Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Clarke dissent.)

Economy Light and Power Company, Appellant, vs. The United States of America. — Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

104

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

per Mr. Justice Pitney.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

The United States of America, Appellant, vs. Northern Pacific Railway Company. — Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

325

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this

be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Montana for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The State of Arkansas,

Complainant,

6, Original. vs.

The State of Mississippi.

Final Decree.

The State of Arkansas, having moved the court to take up for consideration the exceptions filed by the State of Mississippi to the report of the Commissioners appointed by the decree in this cause on the twenty-second day of March, 1920, (252 U. S. 344) to run, locate, and permanently mark the boundary line between the States of Arkansas and Mississippi; and the State of Mississippi, having filed certain exceptions to said report, which report is in the words and figures following, to wit:

"To the Honorable Chief Justice and the Associate Justices of the the Supreme Court of the United States:

We, Samuel S. Gannett, Washington, D. C.; Charles H. Miller, Little Rock, Arkansas, and Stevenson Archer, Jr., Greenville, Mississippi, Commissioners appointed under the decree of the court, rendered March 22, 1920, 'to run, locate and designate the boundary line between said States along that portion of said river which ceased to be a part of the main navigable channel of said river as the result of said avulsion, in accordance with the above principles: Commencing at a point in said Mississippi River about one mile southwest from Friar Point, Coahoma County, Mississippi, where the main navigable channel of said river, prior to said avulsion, turned and flowed in a southerly direction, and thence following along the middle of the former main channel of navigation by its several courses and windings to the end of said portion of said Mississippi River which ceased to be a part of the main channel of navigation of said river as the result of said avulsion of 1848,' have the honor to submit the following report, which report is accompanied by a map entitled:

Supreme Court of the United States.

October Term, 1919.

No. 7, Original.

Map Showing Boundary Line Between States of

Arkansas and Mississippi

Below Friar Point, Mississippi.

On account of a continuous high stage in the Mississippi River it was impracticable to carry on any field-work previous to August 1, 1920, but in the meantime the record was read, local data and maps were examined, and preliminary investigations made in the field.

The Commissioners met at Friar Point, Mississippi, August 4, 1920, and proceeded to view the ground and formulate a plan of procedure.

The determination of the boundary line proceeded upon the finding of the law as laid down by the court, namely, that if the former channel of a river separating two States ceases to be navigable by reason of an avulsion, it does not render inapplicable the rule which fixes as the boundary line the middle of the navigable channel rather than the middle line between the banks (State of Arkansas vs. State of Tennessee, 246 U. S., page 158, sec. 4).

After a study of all the evidence in the case and a careful examination of the physical facts on the ground at this time, the Commissioners are unanimously of the opinion that 'Horseshoe Lake' or 'Old River' or 'Pecan Lake' was, at the time the avulsion or cut-off took place, the main navigable channel of the Mississippi River, and therefore this portion of the boundary line should follow in general the deepest water in this lake.

Leaving the west or lower end of Horseshoe Lake, the boundary line as determined by your Commissioners follows, in general, the course of the present 'channel' or well-defined chute which runs in a northeasterly direction to the Mississippi River, because the evidence on the ground (namely, well-defined high banks on both sides for practically the entire distance, both of which are covered with timber of about the same age; its location west of the meander line of 1833 near the 'Horseshoe Lake' where caving would be expected, and its location east of the meander line of 1833 at a point farther north where accretion would be expected) clearly indicates that this was the last channel actually navigated by the steamboats that entered the 'Horseshoe Lake' several years after the avulsion or cut off of 1848.

In arriving at the proper location for the line between the northeast end of 'Horseshoe Lake' and the Mississippi River at a point about one mile southwest from Friar Point, we considered the following facts and conditions:

(*a*) The Arkansas shore, being in a concave bend, would naturally undergo some caving or recession during the 32 years between the date of the original land survey (1816) and the date of the cut off (1848).

(*b*) The 'slough' immediately east of the field in sections 10 and 15, township 4 south, range 4 east, being total'y devoid of short and irregular bends and following a generally uniform curve of radius similar to that of the original river in this vicinity, was, without doubt, formed by the main river, and the great difference in the age of the timber on the west bank as compared with the age of that on the east bank shows that the west bank of this 'slough' marked the most westerly limit of the main river at the time of the avulsion.

(*c*) The Mississippi land survey of 1825 shows that an island existed at that time near to the Mississippi shore or meander line; evidence on the ground today shows conclusively that this portion of the area is much older than is that part which lies farther to the west. The conformation of the old bank lines is such that accretion to the Mississippi shore in this vicinity is a logical sequence.

We have therefore decided that this line after leaving the northeast end of 'Horseshoe Lake' should gradually swing over towards the northwest and follow the general line of the 'slough,' but in front, or east, of the same, a distance which is approximately equal to that which is ordinarily found between the main bank and the line of deepest water in the Mississippi River.

After reaching a point which is opposite the upper end of this 'slough' we must, in order to reach the present river, cross over, for a distance of approximately a mile, land that has evidently been formed by the process of accretion since the time of the avulsion, and hence the boundary line should be brought east, as soon as is practicable, to a point about midway between the old original meander lines, and thence along this mid-line to the Mississippi River.

Commencing at a point in said Mississippi River, approximate latitude 34° 22′ 18″, longitude 90° 39′ 19″, about one mile west from Friar Point, we herewith specifically describe the boundary line as follows:

S. 30° W. 6,831 feet, or 103.50 chains, to monument (1).
S. 0° W. 2,587 feet, or 39.20 chains, to monument (2).
S. 23° E. 5,035 feet, or 76.29 chains, to monument (3).
S. 11½° E. 4,927 feet, or 74.65 chains.
S. 25° W. 2,805 feet, or 42.50 chains.
S. 70½° W. 2,607 feet, or 39.50 chains.
N. 88½° W. 2,299 feet, or 34.70 chains.
N. 68¼° W. 2,007 feet, or 30.50 chains.
N. 51° W. 1,571 feet, or 23.80 chains.
No. 34° W. 1,733 feet, or 26.25 chains.
No. 4° W. 2,676 feet, or 40.55 chains.
N. 12½° E. 3,383 feet, or 51.25 chains.
N. 31½° E. 3,317 feet, or 50.25 chains.
N. 22¼° E. 2,864 feet, or 43.40 chains.
N. 15° E. 5,148 feet, or 78.00 chains to a point in the Mississippi River, approximate latitude 34° 22′ 04″, longitude 90° 40′ 35″.

Monuments.

Monuments have been set as follows:

State Line Monument No. 1.

Situated in southeast quarter of Sec. 10, T. 4 S., R. 4 E., 600 feet east of west bank of slough and on north side of road through timber-reinforced concrete post 12 inches square, 36 inches high, set on a concrete base 24 by 24 by 24 inches.

Monument marked on west side AI&K, on east side MISS, on north side 1920, on south side No. 1.

State Line Monument No. 2

Situated 2,587 feet due south of State line Mon. No. 1 and is in the N. E. ¼ Sec. 15, T. 4 S., R. 4 E. A reinforced concrete post 12 inches square, 36 inches high, set on a concrete base 24 by 24 by 24 inches.

The monument is marked on west side ARK, on east side MISS, on north side 1920, on south side No. 2.

State Line Monument No. 3.

Situated 5,035 feet S. 23° E. from Monument No. 2 and 2,375 feet west of a point 100 feet south of levee mile post 72-73. It is in north part of Sec. 23, T. 4 S., R. 4 E., a few feet south of line of Sec. 14, T. 4 S., R. 4 E. It is a reinforced concrete post 12 inches square, 36 inches high, set on a concrete base 24 by 24 by 24 inches.

This monument is marked on west side ARK, on east side MISS, on north side 1920, on south side No. 3.

Witness trees: Cottonwood 24 inches diameter bears N. 56° E. 47 feet distant; hackberry 3 inches diameter bears N. 46° E. 6 feet distant. Overcup oak 10 inches diameter bears N. 65° ½ W. 38.5 feet distant.

Reference Point No. 1.

1,025 feet north of corner of Secs. 7 and 18, T. 28 N., R. 4 W., and Secs. 12 and 13, T. 28 N., R. 5 W.

Reinforced concrete post 12 inches square, 36 inches high, set on concrete base 24 by 24 by 24 inches.

Monument is marked on north side REF. PT. No. 1, on south side 1920.

From this monument middle of old River or Horse Shoe Lake or State line bears N. 40° W. 1,353 feet.

Reference Point No. 2.

At ¼ corner between Secs. 10 and 11, T. 28 N., R. 5 W.

Reinforced concrete post 12 inches square, 36 inches high, set on concrete base 24 by 24 inches.

Monument marked on north side REF. PT. No. 2, on south side 1920.

Witness trees: Cottonwood, 14 inch diameter, N. 42° E. 78.6 feet; cottonwood, 24 inch diameter, S. 66° ¼ W. 33.1 feet.

From this monument middle of old River or Horse Shoe Lake or State line bears N. 67° ¾ E. 1,353 feet.

Reference Point No. 3.

At corner of Secs. 2, 3, 34 and 35, Tps. 28 and 29 N., R. 5 W.

Iron post 6 feet long, 2 inches in diameter, set 3 feet in ground.

Witness trees: A sycamore 18 inches diameter bears N. 23° W. 18.3 feet distant; a boxelder 12 inches diameter bears S. 63° ¾ W. 23.3 feet distant.

From this reference point or monument the State line or middle of channel or Horse Shoe Lake is 808 feet due east.

We return herewith a financial statement showing in detail the money actually expended by the Commissioners for running, locating, and designating the boundary line under the decree in this case, including the per diem compensation of the Commissioners.

Respectfully submitted.

SAMUEL S. GANNETT,
CHAS. H. MILLER,
STEVENSON ARCHER, JR.,
Commissioners."

The cause coming on to be heard upon said motion of the State of Arkansas, and exceptions of the State of Mississippi, it is ordered, adjudged, and decreed that the exceptions filed on behalf of the State of Mississippi be and the same are hereby overruled, and said report is in all respects confirmed.

It is further ordered, adjudged, and decreed that the line as delineated and set forth in said report, and upon the map accompanying the same, which line has been marked by permanent monuments, as stated in said report, be and the same is hereby established, declared and decreed to be the true boundary line between the States of Arkansas and Mississippi, and said map is directed to be filed as a part of this decree. And it appearing that the expenses and compensation of the Commissioners attendant upon the discharge of their duties, amounts to $6,116.45, it is ordered that the same be allowed and approved as a part of the costs of this suit to be borne equally by the parties. And it appearing further from the report that the State of Arkansas has paid said sum, it is hereby ordered that it be credited to the State of Arkansas in the settlement of the costs of this suit between the States of Arkansas and Mississippi. It is further ordered that the Clerk of this Court do transmit to the respective Governors of the States of Arkansas and Mississippi copies of this decree, duly

The Baldwin Company, Petitioner, vs. R. S. Howard Company, — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

113

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice Day.

The Baldwin Company and the Valley Gem Piano Company, Appellants, vs. R. S. Howard Company. — Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

139

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Justice Day.

American Steel Foundries, Petitioner, vs. Robert Whitehead, Commissioner of Patents. — On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

131

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Justice Day.

The State of Minnesota, on the relation of C. D. Whipple, Plaintiff in error, vs. Oscar Martinsen, Sheriff of Hennepin County, Minnesota. — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

224

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of the State of Minnesota, and

by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Day.

John P. Galbraith, Petitioner,	On writ of certiorari to the United States
234 vs.	Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth
John Vallely, Trustee in Bank-	Circuit.
ruptcy of Conrad C. Heiswig, Bank-	
rupt.	

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of North Dakota for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Day.

Silver King Coalition Mines	On writ of certiorari to the United States
Company, Petitioner,	Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth
158 vs.	Circuit.
Conkling Mining Company.	

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and the respondent having presented a petition for rehearing, leave to file same is granted, and thereupon in conformity with the opinion of the Court this day delivered,

It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the District of Utah be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Hiram Chase, Jr., a minor, by his next friend, Hiram Chase, Appellant,
242 vs.
The United States of America.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Mary Gilpin, a minor by her next friend, Samuel Gilpin, Appellant,
243 vs.
The United States of America.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The United States, Appellant,
253 vs.
L. P. and J. A. Smith.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

(Mr. Justice Day and Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the decision)

Southern Iowa Electric Company, Appellant, vs. The City of Charlton, Iowa, et al. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Iowa.

180

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Iowa and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Iowa Electric Company, Appellant, vs. City of Fairfield, Iowa et al. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Iowa.

189

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Iowa and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Muscatine Lighting Company, Appellant, vs. City of Muscatine, Iowa, et al. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Iowa.

190

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Iowa and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

City of San Antonio et al., Appellants, vs. San Antonio Public Service Company. 263

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Missouri, Kansas and Texas Railway Company, et al., Petitioners, vs. Hannah L. Zuber. 198

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the tfanscript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte in the matter of the United States (The"Western Maid"). -- Orig. petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file petition for writs of prohibition and / or mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte in the matter of the United States ("The Western Maid") -- orig. Petitioner,

On consideration of the petition for writs of prohition and / or mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that cause be shown by the Honorable J. Whitaker Thompson, Judge of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and other Judges and Officers of said Court, before this Court, at the City of "ashington, on Monday, October 10th, 1921, or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard, why the prayer of said petition should not be granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, April 11th, 1921, continued.

Ex parte in the matter of the United States, ("The Liberty"), -- Orig. Petitioner, On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for writs of prohibition and / or mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte in the matter of the United States ("The Liberty"), -- Orig. petitioner, On consideration of the petition for writs of prohibition and / or mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that cause be shown by the Honorable James M. Morton, Jr., Judge of the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts, and the Officers of said Court, before this Court, at the city of Washington, on Monday, October 10th, 1921, or as soon there after as counsel can be heard, why the prayer of said petition should not be granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte in the matter of the United States ("The Carolinian"), -- Orig. Petitioner, On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for writs of prohibition and / or mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Courtthat the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte in the matter of the United States ("The Carolinian"), -- Orig. petitioner, On consideration of the petition for writs of prohibition and / or mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that cause be shown by the Honorable John C. Rose, Judge of the District Court of the United States for the District of Maryland, and the Officers of said Court, before this Court, at the City of Washington, on Monday, October 10th, 1921, or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard, why the prayer of said petition should not be granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

177 The Standard Fashion Company, Petitioner, vs. Megrane-Houston Company. It is ordered by the Court that this cause be restored to the docket for reargument and the Clerk is directed to notify the Attorney General of the United States of the pendency of this cause.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
346 vs.
Charles G. A. Pfitsch.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be restored to the docket for reargument on the question of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

American Column & Lumber Company et al., Appellants,
369 vs.
The United States of America.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be reassigned for Monday, October 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Pennsylvania Railroad Company,
plaintiff in error,
706 vs.
Isaac C. Weber, Surviving partner etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Archie J. McLaren, Administrator etc., Petitioner,
291 vs.
L. G. Fleischer.
Robert L. Culpepper, Petitioner,
292 vs.
James M. Ocheltree.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Company, petitioner,
766 vs.
David Fruchter, an infant, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of asagainst the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Company, Petitioner,
767 vs.
Sam Fruchter.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Auditore Contracting Company, Inc., et al., Petitioners,
776 vs.
Foreign Trade Banking Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

William D. Haywood et al., Petitioners,
760 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

J. B. Flowers et al., Petitioners,
752 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is

now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ellsworth H. Green et al., Petitioners,
763 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Wagner Electric Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
764 vs.
Lamar Lyndon.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration ofthe petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Mary Flack, Administratrix, etc., Petitioner,
769 vs.
The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Charles O'Connor et al., Petitioners,
772 vs.
John Slacker, Acting Administrator etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

John Barton Payne, as Agent etc., Petitioner,
773 vs.
Matthew Foley.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Maine.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Maine and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

J. Sidney Smith, Petitioner,
787 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Charles M. Thompson, Petitioner,
788 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Clyde A. Smith, Petitioner,

The United States of America. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Edward A. Shedd et al., Petitioner,
825 vs.
Calumet Construction Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Edgar A. Levy Leasing Company, Inc.,
Plaintiff in error,
853 vs.
Jerome Siegel;
The People of the State of New York
ex rel Brixton Operating Company,
plaintiff in error,
854 vs.
Edward B. La Fetra, a Justice, etc.;
810 West End Avenue, Inc.,
plaintiff in error,
855 vs.
Henry R. Stern.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted by Mr. Lewis M. Isaacs in that behalf.

The State of New York et al.,
Appellants,
849 vs.
The United States of America et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. J. E. Benton in that behalf.

The Filer & Stowell Company, Petitioner,
753 vs.
Diamond Iron Works.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. W. G. Henderson Mr. Frank E. Dennett and Mr. Louis A. Lecher for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frank A. Whiteley for the respondent.

Ulrica Dahlgren Pierce, as Trustee, etc., Appellant,
800 vs.
John V. Dahlgren.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. J. Warren Keifer for the appellant in support of the petition and by Mr. Lawrence Maxwell, Mr. F. R. Coudert, Mr. Howard Thayer Kingsbury for the appellee in opposition thereto.

George N. Baxter, Petitioner,
782 vs.
William M. Safford et al.,

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. George N. Baxter pro se, and by Mr. Lawrence Maxwell, Mr. Charles P. Rogers, Mr. Henry H. Glassie, Mr. B. E. Hinton, Mr. Constant Southworth for the respondents with leave to counsel for the petitioner to file supplemental brief within one week.

James J. Rafferty, Collector, etc., Petitioner,
544 vs.
Smith, Bell and Co. Ltd;
James J. Rafferty, Collector, etc., Petitioner,
548 vs.
Compania General de Tabacos de Filipinas; and
James J. Rafferty, Collector, etc., Petitioner,
553 vs.
Visayan Refining Company.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted by Mr. Charles Marvin for the petitioner.

Ulrica Dahlgren Pierce, as Trustee, etc., Appellant,
800 vs.
John V. Dahlgren.

The motion to dismiss this cause was submitted by Mr. Barry Mohun in behalf of Mr. Frederic R. Coudert, Mr. Howard Thayer Kingsbury and Mr. Lawrence Maxwell for the appellee insupport of the motion and by Mr. J. Warren Keifer for the appellant in opposition thereto.

John W. Yates, petitioner,
834 vs.
Charles R. Smith, Executor, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Samuel E. Darby for the petitioner.

William Barber, petitioner,
841 vs.
Otis Motor Sales Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Samuel E. Darby for the petitioner and by Mr. Oscar W. Jeffrey and Mr. Robert D. Eggleston for the respondent.

Charles W. Andersen, Collector, etc.,
783 vs.
New York Life Insurance Company.

The motion for an order setting aside the order of this Court granting the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause was submitted by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney in behalf of Mr. James H. McIntosh for the respondent and by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the petitioner.

The Texas Company, Appellant,
496 vs.
J. J. Brown, etc., et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. J. L. Nesbitt in behalf of counsel.

Charles S. Fairchild, Appellant,
572. vs.
Bainbridge Colby, Secretary of State, et al.

On motion of Mr. Alfred D. Smith for the appellant the resignation of Bainbridge Colby, as Secretary of State, and A. Mitchell Palmer as Attorney General of the United States was suggested, and it is ordered by the Court that Charles E. Hughes, as present Secretary of State, and Harry M. Daugherty, as present Attorney General of the United States, be substituted and made the parties appellees in this cause.

John R. Bailey, petitioner,
794 vs.
Mississippi Home Telephone Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Thomas M. B. Hicks for the petitioner and by Mr. J. Fred Schaffer for the respondent.

Carl A. Martin et al., etc.,
petitioners,
790 vs.
Presidio Mining Company et al.,

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. William Denman for the petitioners, and by Mr. R. T. Harding, Mr. Henry E. Monroe, and Mr. J. J. Dunne for the respondents.

Panayiotis Panoulias, petitioner,
765 vs.
National Equipment Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Frank C. Briggs for the petitioner and by Mr. Livingston Gifford and Mr. William Quinby for the respondent.

Samuel Vernon Estate Inc., petitioner,
815 vs.
John J. Lyttle, as Receiver, and Trustee, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Frederick Seymour for the petitioner, and by Mr. Emanuel J. Myers for the respondent.

Seaboard Transportation Company, Petitioner,
833 vs.
Boston, New York and Cape Cod, Canal Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Edward E. Bledgett for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas H. Mahony for the respondent.

Standard Portland Cement Company, Petitioner,
836 vs.
J. R. Foley.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Augustus Benners for the petitioner.

Gaston, Williams and Wigmore of Canada, Limited, Petitioner,
840 vs.
Philip A. Warner.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Cletus Keating for the petitioner and by Mr. Joseph P. Nolan for the respondent.

The City of New York, Petitioner,
847 vs.
Lynden R. Cennett, et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Vincent Victory for the petitioner and by Mr. Samuel Seabury for the respondents.

James S. McKee et al., Petitioners,
846 vs.
Benjamin Gratz.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Frank H. Sullivan, Mr. Lon O. Hocker and Mr. George F. Haid for the petitioners and by Mr. S. Wayner Wallace for the respondent, concurring.

Standard Oil Company, as Owner, etc., Petitioner,
861 vs.
The Steamship "Falls City". etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. J. Parker Kirlin, Mr. John M. Woolsey, Mr. Edward R. Baird, Jr., and Mr. Robert S. Erskine for the petitioner and by Mr. H. H. Little for the respondents.

J. Q. Smith, Attorney General of the State of Alabama, et al., Appellants,
310 vs.
Wefford Oil Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Alabama.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte in the matter of the Matthew Addy Steamship and Commerce Corporation, Petitioner,
30, Original.

This cause was argued on the return to the rule to show cause by Mr. T. K. Schmuck for the petitioner and by Mr. Gilbert R. Swink and Mr. Edward R. Baird, Jr., for the respondent.

The United States of America, plaintiff in error,
691 vs.
A. Z. Hutto et al.;
The United States of America, plaintiff in error,
692 vs.
A. Z. Hutto.

These cases were argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Garnett for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Sam K. Sullivan for the defendants in error.

Joseph H. Burdeau, Appellants,
646 vs.
J. C. McDowell.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Tuesday, April 12th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., it is ordered that Royal E. T. Riggs, Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hollins N. Randolph, it is ordered that Manwell G. Wallace, Esquire, of Richmond, State of Virginia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants,
867 vs.
The Kings County Lighting Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Charles E. Buchner for the appellants.

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants,
868 vs.
New York and Queens Gas Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Charles E. Buchner for the appellants.

New York Trust Company et al., as Executors, etc., plaintiffs in error,
286 vs.
Mark Eisner.

On motion of Mr. W. H. Hitchcock, leave is hereby granted him to file brief as amicus curiae in this cause.

J. L. Hudson, plaintiff in error,

O. L. Hopkins, as county treasurer, etc., and
William E. McGuire, as Administrator etc., plaintiff in error,
195 vs.
E. J. McCurdy, as county treasurer, etc.

These causes were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Elmer E. Grinstead for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. S. P. Brooking for the defendants in error.

Joseph A. Burdeau, Appellant,
646 vs.
J. C. McDowell.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the appellant, by Mr. E. Lowry Humes for the appellee and concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the appellant.

Seaboard Air Line Railway, Appellant,
62 vs.
The United States.

This cause was re-argued by Mr. Benjamin Carter for the appellant and by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., for the appellee.

Western Union Telegraph Company, Petitioner,
491. vs.
Esteve Brothers & Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Rush Taggart for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. Monte M. Lemann for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, April 13th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke.
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wm. H. Donovan it is ordered that Samuel F. Leber, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Rush Taggart it is ordered that Ingbram D. Hook, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Phil D. Swing, it is ordered that Louis Gonsalves, Esquire, of Oakland, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. A. Jones it is ordered that George R. Craig, Esquire, of Albuquerque, State of New Mexico, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Reed it is ordered that Halbert H. McCluer, Esquire of Kansas City, State of Missouri be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ralph A. Stewart it is ordered that Philip Nichols, Esquire of Boston, State of Massachusetts be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ralph A. Stewart it is ordered that Charles O. Peagra, Esquire of Boston, State of Massachusetts be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William D. Boles it is ordered that Grenville P. North, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Western Union Telegraph Company,
Petitioner,
491 vs.
Esteve Brothers & Company.

The Argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Monte M. Lemann for the respondent and concluded by Mr. John G. Milburn for the petitioner.

American Bank & Trust Company,
et al., Appellants,
679 vs.
Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Frierson in that behalf, leave is hereby granted him to file brief as amicus curiae in this cause.

American Bank & Trust Company,
et al., Appellants,
679 vs.
Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta.

On motion of Mr. Alexander W. Smith for the appellants, three and one half hours were allowed for the oral argument of this cause.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Alexander W. Smith for the appellants and continued by Mr. Hollins N. Randolph and Mr. Robert S. Parker for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Thursday, April 14th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles L. McNary, it is ordered that Chriss A. Bell, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson it is ordered that T. T. McCarley, Esquire of Nashville, State of Tennessee be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. Garland Dupre it is ordered that Nicholas G. Carbajal, Esquire of New Orleans, State of Louisiana be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Conrad H. Syme, it is ordered that Joseph P. Sarley, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Patrick Henry Kelly it is ordered that Frederick Ezekiel De Camp, Esquire of Lansing and James S. Parker, Esquire of Flint, State of Michigan be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Everett Saunders it is ordered that Elza O. Rogers, Esquire of Lebanon, State of Indiana be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duncan U. Fletch it is ordered that Samuel M. Castelton, Esquire of Atlanta, State of Georgia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Ernest B. Dane,
plaintiff in error,
509 vs.
Fred J. Burrell, Treasurer and Receiver General of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

In error to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

American Bank & Trust Company et al., Appellants,
679 vs.
Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Hollins N. Randolph for the appellees and concluded by Mr. Alexander W. Smith for the appellants. Leave was granted to Mr. Alexander W. Smith to file reply brief for the appellants within one week.

Herbert Darlington,
Plaintiff in error,
716 vs.
Harry W. Mager, Collector, etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. Herbert Pope for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the defendant in error.

O. O. Askren, Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants,
695 vs.
Continental Oil Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Harry S. Bowman for the appellants, continued by Mr. Charles R. Brock and Mr. E. B.

Wright for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. Harry S. Bowman for the appellants.

The United States, Appellant,
806 vs.
Western Union Telegraph Company,

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Friday, April 15th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

The United States of America,
Appellants,
806 vs.
Western Union Telegraph Company.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the appellant, by Mr. Rush Taggart for the appellee and concluded by Mr. Joseph P. Cotton for the appellee.

Ernest B. Dane,
plaintiff in error,
720 vs.
James Jackson, Treasurer and Receiver General.

This cause was argued by Mr. Philip Nichols for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. William Harold Hitchcock for the defendant in error.

The United States of America,
plaintiff in error,
246 vs.
Charles G. A. Pfitsch.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Frierson in that behalf it is ordered that this cause be assigned for argument at the head of the call for Monday, April 25th next.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, April 18th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day,

Willis Van Devanter,

Mahlon Pitney,

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

John H. Clarke,

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

James D. Maher, Clerk.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson it is ordered that Samuel Bosworth Smith, Esquire, of Chattanooga State of Tennessee; Richard S. Holmes, Esquire, of New York City, and J. Waties Waring, Esquire, of Charleston, State of South Carolina be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. A. Knapp it is ordered that J. E. Sickler, Esquire, and Henry J. Connolly, Esquire of Scranton, State of Pennsylvania be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James Brown Scott it is ordered that Amos J. Peaslee, Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor as this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fred Dennett it is ordered that George E. Whitaker, Esquire, of Bakersfield, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage it is ordered that Jacob B. Furry, Esquire, of Muskogee, State of Oklahoma be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward F. McClennen, it is ordered that J. Weston Allen, Esquire of Boston, State of Massachusetts be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Sutherland it is ordered that George Williams Mathews, Esquire, of Cambridge, State of Massachusetts be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry B. Hazard it is ordered that Person A. Robbins, Esquire of San Francisco, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel Evans Maires, it is ordered that Thomas Ware Maires, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf be Mr. Charles S. Thomas it is ordered that Lawrence Lewis, Esquire of Denver, State of Colorado be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Doyle Carmody it is ordered that James McKeag, Esquire of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jesse Andews it is ordered that Palmer Hutcheson, Esquire of Houston, State of Texas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. A. Ledbetter it is ordered that William Perry Miller, Esquire of Muskogee, State of Oklahoma be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paul Demes it it ordered that George W. Norvell, [illegible]

admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this Behalf by Mr. Levi Cooke, it is ordered that George R. Beneman, Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Frey & Son, Incorporated, Plaintiff in error, vs. The Cudahy Packing Company. — In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

200

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Maryland.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds,

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Pitney,
Mr. Justice Day,
Mr. Justice Clarke.

C. R. Privett, John O. Mitchell, and J. E. Crosbie, Appellants, vs. The United States of America, H. R. Wilcox, and Oil Production Company. — Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit

236

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma.

The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company, Appellant,
256 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.
The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims with directions to reexamine the company's claim and award a judgment conforming to the views expressed in the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Julius Block, Trading and carrying on business under the name and style of Whites, Plaintiff in error,
640 vs.
Louis Hirsh.
In error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice McKenna,
Mr. Chief Justice White,
Mr. Justice Van Devanter,
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Marcus Brown Holding Company, Inc., Appellant,
731 vs.
Marcus Feldman, Benjamin Schwartz et al.
Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Holmes,

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice McKenna,

Mr. Chief Justice White,

Mr. Justice Van Devanter,

Mr. Justice McReynolds.

J. L. Hudson, plaintiff in error, vs. O. L. Hopkins, as County Treasurer of Osage County, State of Oklahoma. — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

194

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

William E. McGuire, as Administrater of the Estate of Oscar Neal, Plaintiff in error, vs. E. J. McCurdy, as County Treasurer of Osage County, State of Oklahoma. — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

195

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for want of jurisdiction.

N. W. Palmer, W. L. Biggs, Ralph P. Hemphill et al., Plaintiffs in error, vs. Racheal King, Sidney Bond et al. — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

245

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Herbert Darlington, Plaintiff in error, vs. Henry W. Mager, Collector of Internal Revenue for the First District of Illinois. — In error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

716

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ulrica Dahlgren Pierce, as Trustee and Individually, Appellant, vs. John V. Dahlgren. — Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

800

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ulrica Dahlgren Pierce, as Trustee,

800 vs. John V. Dahlgren.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The State of North Dakota,
Complainant,
14 Original. vs.
The State of Minnesota.

To afford an opportunity for the taking of supplemental proof deemed by the court necessary to an adequate consideration and disposition of the cause, it is ordered that the case be restored to the docket to the end that the parties may proceed promptly to take the testimony of not exceeding three engineering experts on each side as to the possibility, within the limits of a reasonable expenditure, of doing away with or ameliorating the flood conditions along the Bois de Sioux River by means other than the injunction prayed for in the bill herein, the testimony thus to be taken to be particularly directed, among other things, to the possibility and effect and estimated cost of any of the following projects: (a) the construction of detaining basins for drainage water throughout the watershed of the Mustinka River for the purpose of withholding a part of the spring waters until the flood period is past; (b) the construction of a sluice dam at any point in Lake Traverse for the purpose of increasing its capacity as a detaining basin; (c) artificial improvement in the channel of the Bois de Sioux River in order to improve its capacity as an outlet for the waters of Lake Traverse in times of flood, so as to prevent overflow and the inundation of the Bois de Sioux valley, the works to include a sluice dam at the foot of Lake Traverse if necessary in order to maintain its level in times of normal flow; (d) lowering the level of Lake Traverse by means of an outlet to Big Stone Lake, controlled by a sluice dam, with a view to increasing its capacity as a detaining basin during the flood period; (e) by diverting some of the drainage water from the so-called Delta Zone, in order to discharge the same down the Mustinka River, to the Rabbit River.

It is further ordered that the parties may take the testimony of not exceeding three witnesses on each side concerning the proper equitable basis for apportioning the expense of any feasible project among the States drained by the Lake Traverse—Bois de Sioux watershed, taking into account, among other considerations, the amount of water discharged by each State into Lake Traverse or the Bois de Sioux River and the benefit conferred by the improvement.

It is further ordered that testimony shall be taken sufficient to advise the Court as to the flood conditions which have prevailed, since the filing of the bill herein, in the area claimed to have been flooded by the action of the State of Minnesota.

Before the taking of the testimony on the subject above referred to and the resubmission of the cause the Court will entertain a motion in this case and the case of *The State of South Dakota* v *The State of Minnesota*, No. 15, Original, to consolidate that case with this if counsel are so advised, to the end that the possibility may be considered of alleviating flood conditions in Lake Traverse and along the Bois de Sioux River by other means than the injunction prayed for in that case and to permit South Dakota to take testimony at the hearing now ordered in this case.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Charles W. Anderson, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc., Petitioner,
783 vs.
New York Life Insurance Company.

It is ordered by the Court that the order granting a writ of certiorari herein be set aside to enable a resubmission of the petition after due notice to counsel for the respondent.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Texas Company, Appellant,
496 vs.
J. J. Brown, Individually and as Commissioner of Agriculture of Georgia, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 10th next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

James J. Rafferty, Collector of Internal revenue for the Philippine Islands,
544 vs. Petitioner,
Smith, Bell and Company, Limited,;

James J. Rafferty, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Philippine Islands,
548 vs. Petitioner,
Compania General de Tabacos de Filiipinas.

James J. Rafferty, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Philippine Islands,
553 vs. Petitioner,
Visayan Refining Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance these causes, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the causes assigned for argument on Monday, October 10th next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The State of New York et al.,
Appellants,
849 vs.
The United States et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Edgar A. Levy Leasing Company, Inc.,
Plaintiff in error,
853 vs.
Jerome Siegel;

The People of the State of New York
ex rel Brixton Operating Corporation,
Plaintiff in error,
854 vs.
Edward B. La Petra, a Justice of the
City Court of the City of New York;

810 West End Avenue, Inc.,
Plaintiff in error,
855 vs.
Henry R. Stern.

On consideration of the motion to advance these causes, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the causes assigned for argument on Monday, October 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General
of the State of New York et al., etc.,
Appellants,
867 vs.
The Kings County Lighting Company;

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General
of the State of New York et al., etc.,
868 vs.
New York and Queens Gas Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance these causes, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the causes assigned for argument on Monday, October 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Gaston, William and Wigmore of Canada,
Limited, Petitioner,

840 vs. Philip A. Warner. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

James S. McKee et al., Petitioners, 846 vs. Benjamin Gratz. On petitions for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petitions for writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petitions be, and the same are hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Filer & Stowell Company, Petitioner, 753 vs. Diamond Iron Works. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Panayiotis Panoulias, Petitioner, 765 vs. National Equipment Company. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

John N. Bailey, Petitioner,
794 vs.
Mississippi Home Telephone
Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and of the argument of counsel, thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Samuel Vernon Estate (Inc),
Petitioner,
815 vs.
John J. Lyttle, as Receiver and
Trustee etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Seaboard Transportation Company,
Petitioner,
833 vs.
Boston, Cape Cod & New York Canal
Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

John W. Yates, Petitioner,
834 vs.
Charles R. Smith, Executor,
etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Standard Portland Cement Company, Petitioner,
836 vs.
J. R. Foley.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

William Barber, Petitioner,
841 vs.
Otis Meter Sales Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The City of New York, Petitioner,
842 vs.
Lyndon R. Connett et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Standard Oil Company, as Owner of the Steamship John D. Rockefeller,
861 vs. Petitioner,
The Steamship Falls City, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

New York Trust Company et al., Executors, etc.,
Plaintiffs in error,
286 vs.
Mark Eisner.

On motion of Mr. John B. Gleason in that behalf, leave is hereby granted him to file brief as amicus curiae in this cause.

Southern Pacific Railroad Co.,
Appellant,
348 vs.
John Barton Payne, Secretary, etc., et al.

On motion of Mr. A. A. Hoehling, the resignations of John Barton Payne, as Secretary of the Interior and of Clay Tallman as Commissioner of the General Land Office were suggested, and it is ordered that Albert B. Fall, present Secretary of the Interior and William Spry, present Commissioner of the General Land Office be substituted and made the parties appellees herein.

McKittrick Oil Company,
Plaintiff in error,
601 vs.
Southern Pacific Railroad Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Fred Dennett and Mr. George E. Whitaker for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frank Thuman and Mr. A. A. Hoehling for the respondent.

The State of Texas, Appellant,
870 vs.
Eastern Texas Railroad Co. et al.

The application for a restraining order herein wassubmitted by Mr. C. M. Cureton and Mr. Tom L. Beauchamp for the appellant in support of the motion and by Mr. Daniel Upthegrove and Mr. E. B. Perkins for the appellee in opposition thereto.

Louis Krasik et al., as Trustees, etc.,
Petitioners,

Henry Doscher et al., as Executors, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Samuel Evans Maires for the petitioner and by Mr. Henry F. Cochrane for the respondents.

J. C. Dysart, petitioner,
780 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Cecil H. Smith and Mr. William H. Atwell for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. William C. Herron for the respondent.

Boston and Maine Railroad, Petitioner,
781 vs.
Timothy J. Desmond.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Frederick N. Wier for the petitioner and by Mr. James H. Vahey for the respondent.

Joseph Rosenblatt, Petitioner,
873 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Charles Hershenstein for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. William C. Herron for the respondent.

Samuel Davidson, petitioner,
874 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Allen H. Campbell and Mr. Mark Hyman for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. William C. Herron for the respondent.

The United States, Appellant,
811 vs.
Alan H. Woodward et al., as executors, etc.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the appellant, continued by Mr. E. J. Symes for the appellees and concluded by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., for the appellant.

The United States of America, Appellant,
21 vs.
The Southern Pacific Company et al.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Frierson in that behalf, three hours were allowed to each side for the oral argument of this cause.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Edward F. McClennen for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Tuesday, April 19th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duncan U. Fletcher it is ordered that Fred Botts, Esquire, of Miami, State of Florida be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Garret W. McEnerney it is ordered that William Stuart Fleming, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles N. Burch it is ordered that Clinton H. McKay, Esquire of Memphis, State of Tennessee be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Weston Allen it is ordered that William Flaherty, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. W. Byrnes, it is ordered that Frank K. Beal, Esquire, of Chattanooga, State of Tennessee be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Will R. King it is ordered that Jay Turley, Esquire, of Turley, State of New Mexico be admitted

to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

The New York Trust Company et al., Executors, etc., Plaintiffs in error, vs. Mark Bisnor. 286

The motion of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for leave to participate in the oral argument of this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Weston Allen in that behalf.

Joseph Ople, Petitioner, vs. George P. Weinbrenner, Sheriff; 797

Earl Miller, Petitioner, vs. George P. Weinbrenner, Sheriff; 798

Lee Clyne, Petitioner, vs. George P. Weinbrenner, Sheriff. 799

The petitions for writs of certiorari in these cases were submitted by Mr. Charles A. Houts for the petitioners.

The United States of America, Appellant, vs. Southern Pacific Company et al. 21

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Edward F. McClennen for the appellants and by Mr. Garret W. McEnerney for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, April 20th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. Wayne Parker it is ordered that Clyde D. Souter, Esquire of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arcadius L. Agatin, it is ordered that Francis M. DeGreat, Esquire, of Duluth, State of Minnesota be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Orville Bullington it is ordered that Fletcher W. Fischer, Esquire, of Wichita Falls, State of Texas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard P. Ernst it is ordered that Joseph Selligman, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Horace B. Durant it is ordered that Bailey E. Bell, Esquire of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward F. McClennen, it is ordered that Mrs. Jennie Leitman Barron, of Boston, State of Massachusetts be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and she was sworn accordingly.

New York Trust Company et al., Executors, etc., plaintiffs in error,
286 vs.
Mark Bismer.

On motion of Mr. A. G. Agatin in that behalf, leave is hereby granted him to file brief as amicus curiae in this cause.

The United States of America, Appellant,
21 vs.
Southern Pacific Company et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Garret W. McEnerney for the appellees and concluded by Mr. Joseph P. Blair for the appellees.

Yee Won, petitioner,
209 vs.
Edward White, as Commissioner of Immigration, etc.

This cause was submitted by Mr. M. Walton Henry and Mr. John L. McNab for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the respondent.

Mike Blancett, Appellant,
244 vs.
Oscar Cardin, as Guardian, etc., et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Henry C. Lewis for the appellant, continued by Mr. A. C. Wallace for the appellees, by Mr. Leslie C. Garnett for the United States, by special leave of Court, and concluded by Mr. Paul A. Ewert for the appellant.

The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, plaintiff in error,
157 vs.
Daniel J. Perry.

This cause was argued by Mr. C. O. Blake for the plaintiff in error, and submitted by Mr. Ed S. Vaught and Mr. J. H. Everest for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Thursday, April 21st, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Soliciter General Frierson it is ordered that Nels J. Holter, Esquire of Chicago, State of Illinois and John G. Maher, Esquire, of Lincoln, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ralph B. Fleharty it is ordered that Walter C. Van Emon, Esquire, of Klamath Falls, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Wisconsin-Minnesota Light & Power Company, Appellant,
532 vs.
Railroad Commission of Wisconsin et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Wisconsin.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Herman Wessels, Appellant,
287 vs.
John D. McDonald, Commandant of the United States Navy Yard, Brooklyn, New York.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Choctaw, Oklahoma and Gulf Railroad Company et al.,
Appellants,
211 vs.
B. W. Mackey, as county treasurer, etc., et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. C. O. Blake for the appellants and by Mr. J. B. Furry for the appellees.

Weber Electric Company, Petitioner,
273 vs.
E. H. Freeman Electric Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Charles Neave for the petitioner and by Mr. Livingston Gifford for the respondent.

Anna Heitmuller,
plaintiff in error,
279 vs.
Sylvanus Stokes.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Chapin Brown for the plaintiff in error and continued by Mr. Wharton E. Lester for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Friday, April 22d, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Huston Thompson it is ordered that C. L. Lagey, Esquire, of Beloit, State of Kansas and Adrien F. Busick, Esquire, of McLean, State of Virginia be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and theywere sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ernest Wilkinson it is ordered that Hugh M. Wilkinson, Esquire of New Orleans, State of Louisiana be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Merritt Cramer Mechem it is ordered that E. C. Iden, Esquire, of Albuquerque, State of New Mexico be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George M. Morris it is ordered that Arnold H. Baar, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel M. Shortridge it is ordered that EdwardF. Moran, Esquire, of San Francisco, Stateof California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Cox it is ordered that William Jennings Bryan, Jr., Esquire of Tucson, State of Arizona be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Anna Heitmuller, Plaintiff in error,
279 vs.
Sylvanus Stokes.
Chapin Brown for the defendant in error.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Wharton E. Lester for the defendant in error and concluded by Mr. Chapin Brown for the defendant in error.

New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Company,
plaintiff in error & petitioner,
280 vs.
York and Whitney Company.
York and Whitney Company,
plaintiff in error and petitioner,
281 vs.
New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. William L. Parsons for the Railroad Company and by Mr. Amos L. Taylor for the York and Whitney Company.

The Yazoo & Mississippi Valley Railroad Company, Petitioner,
216 vs.
Nicholas & Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Charles N. Burch for the petitioner and by Mr. John W. Cuterer for the respondent.

The District of Columbia, Petitioner,
282 vs.
R. P. Andrews Paper Company;
The District of Columbia, Petitioner,
283 vs.
Saks and Company;
The District of Columbia, Petitioner,
284 vs.
Abraham Lisner.

The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr. Francis H. Stephens for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, April 25th, 1921,

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Otis Wingo, it is ordered that Samuel S. Langley, Esquire, of Murfreesboro, State of Arkansas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry S. Berger it is ordered that Charles V. Meehan, Esquire and George Curtis Shinn, Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Everett Sanders it is ordered that Henry Adamson, Esquire of Terre Haute, State of Indiana be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. T. Newcomb it is ordered that Francis J. McLoughlin, Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fred Dennett it is ordered that Ira M. Flocker, Esquire of Santa Monica, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. A. Prevost it is ordered that Robert S. Barry, Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline it is ordered that Montgomery B. Angell, Esquire of Rochester, State of New York be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr. it is ordered that Robert H. Lovett, Esquire, of Peoria, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

J. LeRoy Nickel and Nellie Miller Nickel, as Trustees, etc., et al., Plaintiffs in error, vs. George A. Cole, as State Comptroller of the State of Nevada. — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nevada.

268

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nevada and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice McKenna.

(Mr. Justice Clarke took no part in the decision of this case.)

Nellie Miller Nickel and J. Leroy Nickel, as Trustees, etc., et al., plaintiffs in error, vs. The State of Nevada. — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nevada.

269

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript o. the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nevada and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this

costs. per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice McKenna.

(Mr. Justice Clarke took no part in the decision of this case).

J. Leroy Nickel et al., as Trustees, etc., et al., Plaintiffs in error,
268 vs.
George A. Cole, as State Comptroller of the State of Nevada.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Nellie Miller Nickel et al., as Trustees, etc., et al., plaintiffs in error,
269 vs.
The State of Nevada.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Ex parte in the Matter of Thomas G. Moran, petitioner.
-- Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file petition for writs of certuorari, prohibition, and mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte in the matter of Henry O. Hollander, petitioner,
-- Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file petition for writs of certiorari, prohibition and mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The State of Texas, Appellant,
870 vs.
Eastern Texas Railroad Company.

On consideration of the motion of counsel for appellant for an order suspending the decree of the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas dissolving the restraining order theretofore granted in this cause by the Honorable George Calhoun, Judge of the Fifty-third Judicial District Court of the State of

Texas, dated the 9th day of July, A. D. 1920, while said cause was pending in said Court, and prior to its removal to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas by order entered on the 19th day of October, A. D. 1920, and to preserve the status quo pending this appeal,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and the said decree of the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas, above referred to, is hereby suspended and the status quo herein is directed to be preserved pending this appeal.

It is further ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, October 10th, 1921, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

George N. Baxter, petitioner, vs. William M. Safford et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

782

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as well as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Carl A. Martin, et al., etc., petitioners, vs. Presidio Mining Company et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

790

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel, thereupon had as well in support of as well as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

J. C. Dysart, petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

780

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument

of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as well as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Boston & Maine Railroad, Petitioner, vs. Timothy J. Desmond. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Superior Court of the State of Massachusetts.

781

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court of the State of Massachusetts and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Joseph Ople, petitioner, vs. George P. Weinbrenner, Sheriff, etc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

797

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri and of the argument of counsel in support of the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Earl Miller, petitioner, vs. George P. Weinbrenner, Sheriff, etc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

798

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri and of the argument of counsel in support of the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Leo Clyne, petitioner, vs. George P. Weinbrenner, Sheriff, etc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

799

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri and of the argument of counsel in support of the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

McKitterick Oil Company, plaintiff in error, vs. Southern Pacific Railroad Company. 801

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Louis Karasik, et al., as Trustees, petitioners, vs. Henry Descher, et al., as Executors, etc. 843

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as well as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Joseph Rosenblatt, petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 873

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as well as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Samuel Davidson, petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 874

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied..

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Chief Justice announced that the call of the docket will be suspended for the term on Friday the 29th instant, and that the Court will take a recess

on Monday, May 2d, to Monday, May16th, next.

The chief Justice also announced that no petitions for writs of certiorari or motions, except motions for admission to practice, will be received after Tuesday, May 31st, next.

Charles W. Anderson, Collector, etc., petitioner,
783 vs.
New York Life Insurance Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was re-submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the petitioner and by Mr. James H. McIntosh for the respondent.

The United States of America, plaintiff in error,
246 vs.
Charles G. A. Pfitsch,

On motion of Mr. R. E. T. Riggs, in that behalf, leave is hereby granted him to file brief as amicus curiae in this cause.

Ford Motor Company, petitioner,
881 vs.
Hotel Woodward Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. John W. Davis, Mr. Alfred Lucking Mr. James M. Beck for the petitioner and by Mr. Charles H. Tuttle for the respondent.

Walker D. Hines, Director General of Railroads, etc., plaintiff in error,
869 vs.
Cena I. Baechtel et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney and Mr. John Spalding Flannery for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition.

Walker D. Hines, Director General of Railroads, etc., plaintiff in error,
869 vs.
Cena I. Baetchel et al.

On motion of Mr. Frederic D. McKenney in that behalf, the resignation of Walker D. Hines as Director General of Railroads was suggested, and it is ordered that James C. Davis, his successor in office, be and he is hereby, made the party plaintiff in error in this cause.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
23 Original.
The State of Texas.

The motion of John M. Taylor, individually and on behalf of the Cherokee Nation of Indians, for leave to intervene and for the ap-

pointment of a receiver, etc., in this cause was submitted by Mr. John M. Taylor, pro se.

Arthur A. Jones et al., petitioners, 821 vs. Gregory Page, receiver, etc, et al. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Chapin Brown for the petitioners.

Associated Oil Company, petitioner, 851 vs. Walter L. Miller, etc., et al. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. James A. Baker for the petitioner and by Mr. Luther Nickels for the respondent.

Snake Creek Mining and Tunnel Company, petitioner, 880 vs. Midway Irrigation Company et al. On motion of Mr. Frank A. Mobeker in that behalf, leave is hereby granted him to file brief as amicus curiae in this cause.

Bullock Tractor Company, petitioner, 826 vs. J. Herbert Knapp and Parker N. Black partners, etc. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., Mr. John E. Miller, Mr. Merritt Starr, Mr. Edward Osgood Brown, Mr. Thomas E. Haven, and Mr. James C. McMath for the petitioner, and by Mr. Phil D. Swing for the respondent.

Erie Railroad Company, petitioner, 818 vs. Fred D. Ward. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Halsey Sayles for the petitioner and by Mr. Thomas A. Sullivan for the respondent.

Al Weathers, petitioner, 824 vs. The United States of America. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Charles J. Hegarty and Mr. O. P. Hubbard for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. William C. Herron for the respondent.

Clifford E. Treat, petitioner, 863 vs. Redtop Electric Company. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Frederick S. Lyon for the petitioner and by Mr. Henry J. Lucke and Mr. Robert Watson for the respondent.

Chicago Railway Equipment Company

872 vs. Henry D. Laughlin.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Harrison Musgrave and Mr. Henry R. Platt for the petitioners and by Mr. Louis E. Hart for the respondent.

Snake Creek Mining & Tunnel Company, Petitioner,
860 vs.
Midway Irrigation Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. H. R. MacMillan and Mr. John A. Marshall for the petitioner, and by Mr. A. B. Irvine for the respondents.

Michigan Central Railroad Company, petitioner,
886 vs.
C. A. Gustafson et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Ralph M. Shaw and Mr. Frank E. Robson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Hobart P. Young for the respondents, with leave to file the printed hereafter.

The District of Columbia, petitioner,
282 vs.
R. P. Andrews Paper Company;
The District of Columbia, petitioner,
283 vs.
Saks and Company;
The District of Columbia, petitioner,
284 vs.
Abraham Lisner.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Francis H. Stephend for the petitioner, by Mr. M. D. Rosenberg and Mr. Charles L. Frailey for the respondents and concluded by Mr. Francis H. Stephens for the petitioner.

The United States of America,
plaintiff in error,
246 vs.
Charles G. A. Pfitsch.

This cause was reargued on the question of jurisdiction by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Arthur B. King for the defendant in error.

New York Trust Company et al., as Executors, etc.,
plaintiffs in error,
286 vs.
Mark Eisner.

On motion of Mr. George Sutherland in that behalf, three hours were allowed for the oral argument of this cause.

Leave was granted to Mr. J. Weston Allen to take part in the oral argument on behalf of the State of Massachusetts et al., as amici curiae, and to Mr. John B. Gleason to take part in the oral

argument on behalf of the State Comptroller of the State of New York as amicus curiae.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. George Sutherland for the plaintiffs in error and continued by Mr. John B. Gleason for the State Comptroller of the State of New York.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Tuesday, April 26th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day,

Willis Van Devanter,

Mahlon Pitney,

James C. McReynolds

Louis D. Brandeis,

John H. Clarke,

Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. Edgar Barnes it is ordered that Abraham Wernick, Esquire of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania be admitted to practice as an attorney and counseller of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson it is ordered that John S. Fletcher, Esquire, of Chattanooga, State of Tennessee be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Melville Church it is ordered that John Thomas Smith, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles D. Mahaffie it is ordered that Thomas Mullen Woodward, Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fred S. Purnell it is ordered that Conrad Wolf, Esquire, of Kokomo, State of Indiana be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. E. Denison it is ordered that Andrew S. Caldwell, Esquire, of Carbondale, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. P. Granville Munson it is ordered that Frederic B. Colver, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas Sterling it is ordered that Oscar A. Kropf, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. P. Freeling it is ordered that R. H. Matthews, Esquire of McAlester, and Ezra Brainerd, Jr., Esquire of Muskogee, State of Oklahoma be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. R. Serven it is ordered that Albert Chester Travis, Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Missouri, Kansas and Texas Railway Company, Appellant,
52 vs.
The United States.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Alexander Britton for the appellant and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Davis, Mr. J. Hebert Anderson, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart for the appellee.

J. W. Hurley, Appellant,
302 vs.
The Commission of Fisheries of Virginia et al.

It is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, continued per stipulation of counsel

New York Trust Company et al., as Executors, etc.,
plaintiffs in error,
286 vs.
Mark Eisner.

Tuesday, April 26th, 1921, continued.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. John B. Gleason for the State Comptroller of the State of New York as amicus curiae, by special leave of Court; by Mr. J. Weston Allen, for the State of Massachusetts et al., as amici curiae, by special leave of Court; by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. George Sutherland for the plaintiff in error.

The Houston & Texas Central Railroad Company, plaintiff in error,
288 vs.
The City of Ennis et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Jesse Andrews for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Rhodes S. Baker for the defendants in error.

Archie J. McLaren, Administrator, etc., petitioner,
291 vs.
L. G. Fleischer; and
Robert L. Culpepper, petitioner,
292 vs.
James M. Ocheltree.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Samuel Herrick for the petitioners and continued by Mr. Patrick H. Loughran for the respondents.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, April 27th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank H. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wesley L. Jones, it is ordered that Edwin Lockwood MacLean, Esquire of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur C. Wallace, it is ordered that Lewis A. Wetzel, Esquire of Miami, State of Oklahoma be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Noberson it is ordered that J. B. Harris, Esquire, of Jackson, State of Mississippi be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. King it is ordered that Frank E. Hohman, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ashby Williams it is ordered that Henry T. Hunt, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline it is ordered that Frank H. Towner, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert N. Miller it is ordered that Alfred S. Weil, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Louis Sablowski et al., Petitioners,
850 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. William J. Fallon for the petitioner and by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson and Mr. Robert P. Frierson for the respondent.

Henry Albers, Petitioner,
308 vs.
The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and Mr. Solicitor General Frierson, of counsel for the respondent, having filed a confession of error and moved the Court to reverse the judgment herein,

It is therefore, in pursuance of said confession and motion, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon for further proceedings.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Archie J. McLaren, Administrator, etc., Petitioner,
291 vs.
L. G. Fleischer; and
Robert L. Culpepper, petitioner,
292 vs.
James M. Ocheltree.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Patrick H. Loughran for the respondents and concluded by Mr. Samuel Herrick for the petitioners.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,

Wednesday, April 27th, 1921, continued.

295 vs. George E. Bowling et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Leslie C. Garnett for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Halbert H. McCluer for the defendants in error.

The United States of America, petitioner,

296 vs. Aetna Explosives Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Hanson for the petitioner and continued by Mr. Addison S. Pratt for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Thursday, April 28th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day,

Willis Van Devanter,

Mahlon Pitney,

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

John H. Clarke,

Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Rossa F. Downing it is ordered that Marie A. Easby-Smith, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Theodore E. Burton, it is ordered that Samuel H. West, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Oklahoma Natural Gas Company, plaintiff in error,
312 vs.
The State of Oklahoma et al.

It is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, continued per stipulation of counsel.

The United States of America, petitioner,
296 vs.
Aetna Explosives Company.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Addison S. Pratt for the respondent.

Philadelphia and Reading Railway Company, petitioner,
297 vs.
Maria Domenica Di Donato.

This cause was argued by Mr. George Gowen Parry for the petitioner and by Mr. Francis H. Bohlen for the respondent.

Philadelphia and Reading Railway Company, petitioner,
298 vs.
Marie E. Polk.

This cause was argued by Mr. George Gowen Parry for the petitioner and by Mr. Francis M. McAdams for the respondent.

Michigan Central Railroad Company, petitioner,
299 vs.
Mark Owen and Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Frank H. Towner for the petitioner and by Mr. William B. Moulton for the respondent.

Hannah T. Wilson, plaintiff in error,
303 vs.
Curtis C. McDonell.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Henry E. Davis for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Friday, April 29th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson, it is ordered that Olive/ Scott Gabriel, of New York City, and Alfred S. Pinkerton, Esquire, of Worcester, State of Massachusetts be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Moses P. Kinkaid it is ordered that Morton Elmer Frank, Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James C. Davis it is ordered that Irving Herriott, Esquire of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Augustus O. Stanley, it is ordered that Ronald C. Oldham, Esquire, of Richmond, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Reed it is ordered that Lyndol L. Young, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

William R. Begg, et al., Receivers etc., Appellants,
314 vs.
The City of New York et al.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed per stipulation of counsel.

The Dwelling Building & Loan Association et al., Appellants,
318 vs.
Winfield S. MacHenry, Trustee, etc.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Joseph Gilfillan and Mr. George C. Graham for the appellants and by Mr. H. Edgar Barnes and Mr. Owen J. Roberts for the appellee.

Hannah T. Willson,
plaintiff in error,
303 vs.
Curtis C. McDonnell.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Henry E. Davis for the plaintiff in error, by Mr. Levi H. David for the defendant in error and concluded by Mr. Henry E. Davis for the plaintiff in error.

John B. Sutton, Trustee, etc.,
Appellant,
307 vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. John B. Sutton for the appellant and by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., for the appellee.

Daniel Boyle et al., Appellants,
309 vs.
A. M. Holter Hardware Company et al.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be and the same is hereby, continued per stipulation of counsel.

The City of New York, Appellant,
311 vs.
The Brooklyn Union Gas Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Vincent Victory for the appellant and submitted by Mr. William N. Dykman for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, May 2d, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson it is ordered that Cordell Hull, Esquire, of Carthage, and W. H. Watkins, Esquire of Chattanooga, State of Tennessee and Wilson Martindale Compton, Esquire of Wooster, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. C. South it is ordered that George O. Wallace, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ogle Marbury it is ordered that Philip B. Perlman, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Park Trammell it is ordered that James R. Cooper, Esquire, of DeLand, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Levi Cooke it is ordered that Joseph Stein, Esquire; Charles S. Moore, Esquire; and William T. Kelley, Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Merrill Moores it is ordered that Ferdinand Henry Wurzer, Esquire of Detroit, State of Michigan be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, it is ordered that Mark M. Horblit, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Needham it is ordered that Charles H. Farrell, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas Sterling it is ordered that Martin E. Sheldon, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

The People of the State of New York,
Complainant,
2, Original. vs.
The State of New Jersey et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the pleadings and proofs, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the bill of complaint herein be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs, without prejudice.

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

The St. Louis and East St. Louis Electric Railway Company,
plaintiff in error,
261 vs.
The State of Missouri at the relation and to the use of James Hagerman, Jr., Collector of the City of St. Louis, in the State of Missouri.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the

same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Truman H. Newberry et al., Plaintiffs in error, vs. The United States of America. — In error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Michigan.

559

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Michigan and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

(Mr. Justice McKenna concurs in the opinion as applied to the statute under consideration, which was enacted prior to the seventeenth amendment, but he reserves the question of power of congress under that amendment.)

(The Chief Justice dissents from the opinion, but concurs with a modification in the judgment of reversal).

Mr. Justice Pitney, Mr. Justice Brandeis, and Mr. Justice Clarke concur in the judgment, but dissent from the opinion.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company, Appellant, vs. Lorenzo D. Thompson, State Treasurer of the State of Missouri, and Jesse W. Barrett, Attorney General of the State of Missouri. — Appeal fromthe District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

636

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
23, Original. vs.
The State of Texas.

On consideration of the motion of John M. Taylor, et al., for leave to intervene herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Snake Creek Mining & Tunnel Company,
Petitioner,
860 vs.
Midway Irrigation Company et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as well as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Charles W. Anderson, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.,
petitioner,
783 vs.
New York Life Insurance Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the writ of certiorari heretofore issued be recalled and that said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Erie Railroad Company, petitioner,
818 vs.
Fred D. Ward.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Arthur A. Jones et al., Petitioners, vs. Gregory Page, Receiver, etc., et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico.

821

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as well as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Al Weathers, petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

824

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Bullock Tractor Company, petitioner, vs. J. Herbert Knapp and Parker M. Black, partners as Knapp & Black. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

826

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as well as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Louis Sablowski et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States. — On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

850

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is

Associated Oil Company, petitioner,
851 vs.
Walter L. Miller and his wife,
Mattie E. Miller, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Clifford E. Treat, petitioner,
863 vs.
Redtop Electric Company, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, etc.,
plaintiffs in error.
869 vs.
Cena I. Baechtel et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Chicago Railway Equipment Company, et al.,
petitioners,
872 vs.
Henry D. Laughlin.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ford Motor Company, petitioner,
881 vs.
Hotel Woodward Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Julius F. Smietanka, Collector etc.,
710 vs.
Indiana Steel Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson in that behalf.

Clark T. Henderson, petitioner,
844 vs.
The Commissioner of Patents.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Henry H. Snelling in behalf of Mr. Melville Church, Mr. Wylie C. Margeson, and Mr. Edwin B. H. Tower, Jr., for the petitioners.

Ex parte In the Matter of
Exporters of Manufacturers'
Products, Inc., petitioner,
-- Original.

The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus and / or a writ of prohibition herein was submitted by Mr. Henry M. Ward for the petitioner.

Ex Parte In the Matter of C. C. Hartwell Company, Limited, et al.,
-- Original. Petitioners,

The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted by Mr. William B. Grant for the petitioners.

Ex parte In the Matter of D. H.
Riddle, petitioner,
-- Original.

The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted by Mr. Benjamin Carter for the petitioner.

Louisiana & Pine Bluff Railway
Company, appellant,
859 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Charles H. Farrell for the respondent.

The Eureka Pipe Line Company, plaintiff in error,
805 vs.
Walter S. Hallanan, State Tax Commissioner, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. J. M. Beck and Mr. Frank L. Crawford for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition.

The Eureka Pipe Line Company, plaintiff in error,
805 vs.
Walter S. Hallanan, State Tax Commissioner, et al.; and
United Fuel Gas Company, plaintiff in error,
835 vs.
Walter S. Hallanan, State Tax Commissioner, et al. etc.

The motion to advance and consolidate for hearing herein was submitted by Mr. William G. Mathews for the defendants in error.

John W. Keogh, plaintiff in error,
823 vs.
Chicago & Northwestern Railway Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. H. P. Young for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition and by Mr. Bruce Scott, Mr. O. M. Dynes, Mr. F. W. Dickson, and Mr. Walter H. Jacobs for the defendants in error in opposition thereto.

United Fuel Gas Company, plaintiff in error,
835 vs.
Walter S. Hallanan, State Tax Commissioner, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Malcom Jackson for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition.

The Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railway Company of Texas et al., Petitioners,
847 vs.
United State Mortgage & Trust Company et al., Trustees.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Alexander H. McKnight for the petitioners and by Mr. Francis Marion Etheridge, Mr. Alfred A. Cook, and Mr. William Greenough for the respondents.

James D. Hardin, petitioner,
848 vs.
Union Trust Company of Philadelphia.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. B. F. Stewart for the petitioner and by Mr. Chambers Keller for the respondent.

Fred B. Grant, et al., petitioners,
860 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. John L. Rich and Mr. T. Morris Wampler for the petitioners and by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson and Mr. Robert P. Frierson, for the respondents.

Director General of Railroads,
petitioner,
865 vs.
Sarah A. Wilson, Administratrix,
etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. George A. Bourgeois and Mr. Harry H. Coblenb for the petitioner.

Charles Vincenti et al., petitioners,
877 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Ogle Marbury and Mr. Philip B. Perlman for the petitioners and by Mrs. Assistant Attorney General Adams for the respondent.

Nettie L. Scott, petitioner,
882 vs.
Elizabeth K. De Fries, nee Philipo.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Frederick Milverton for the petitioner, with leave to counsel for the respondent to file brief in opposition within one week.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, May 16th next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, May 16th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present.

The Honorable Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justices.
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Phil D. Swing, it is ordered that Joseph M. Mehl, Esquire, of Story City, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Melville Church it is ordered that Charles Orr Marshall, Esquire, of Toledo, State of Ohio, Arthur W. Davidson, Esquire and Sidney F. Smith, Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia, and David Rines, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson it is ordered that David Sholtz, Esquire, of Datona, State of Florida, Guy D. Goff, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin; Edward J. Clark, Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia, and Grenville Clark, Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. Silo Gottlieb it is ordered that Herman A. Kushkind, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. B. Clint Cole it is ordered that James May Stillings, Esquire, of Benton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. A. Elston, it is ordered that Elisha B. Carrier, Esquire, of Los Angeles and Edward H. Eliassen, Esquire of Oakland, State of California be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellorw of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James M. Sheridan, it is ordered that Rafael Morales y Guzman, Esquire of Madalacat, Pampanga, Philippine Islands be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Miles Poindexter it is ordered that Claude D. Mandall, Esquire, of Spokane, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. O'B. Cooper it is ordered that Harry H. Shelton, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. I. Howard, it is ordered that Homer H. Sparks, Esquire, of Wichita Falls, State of Texas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph Millenson it is ordered that Jacob L. Aaron, Esquire of Boston, State of Massachusetts be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Scott Ferris it is ordered that John M. Wheeler, Esquire of Muskogee, State of Oklahoma be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. Prescott Catley it is ordered that James A. C. Palmer, Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. A. Ledbetter it is

ordered that Warren T. Spies, Esquire, of Bartlesville and R. R. Bell, Esquire of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Mason it is ordered that Charles E. Byrne, Esquire and John J. Gorman, Esquire of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. B. H. Lyon it is ordered that Moe Levy, Esquire of Norfolk, State of Virginia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Cecil H. Clegg, it is ordered that Enloe V. Vernor, Esquire of Muskogee, State of Oklahoma be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl R. Chindblom it is ordered that Oscar W. Brecher, Esquire of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. Carroll Todd it is ordered that Henry L. McCune, Esquire of Kansas City, State of Missouri be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. S. Huckman it is ordered that Frederick Transom, Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia and Martin E. Anderson, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Byrne, it is ordered that Samuel I. Jacobs, Esquire of Providence, State of Rhode Island be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer it is ordered that Abraham B. Keefer, Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia be

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. M. Shortridge it is ordered that Clarence W. Morris, Esquire of San Francisco, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence M. Oddie it is ordered that Tasker L. Oddie, Esquire of Reno, State of Nevada be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

The Vicksburg, Shreveport & Pacific Railway Company, The Kansas City Southern Railway Company, and Texarkana & Fort Smith Railway Company,
Plaintiff in error,
270 vs.
Anderson-Tully Company.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Mississippi.

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Ex Parte In the Matter of the Matthew Addy Steamship and Commerce Corporation, 30, Original. Petitioner,

this cause came on to be heard on the petition for a writ of mandamus and the return to the rule to show cause, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said rule to show cause be discharged and that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Yee Won, Petitioner,
209 vs.
Edward White, as Commissioner of
Immigration, Port of San Francisco,

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from theUnited States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds,

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Clarke.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
296 vs.
Aetna Explosives Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Court of Customs Appeals, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Court of Customs Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Clarke.

(Mr. Justice Day took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

The New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Company, Petitioner,
280 vs.
York & Whitney Company.

York & Whitney Company, Petitioner,
281 vs.
The New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Company,

On writs of certiorari to the Superior Court of the State of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Superior Court of the State of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Superior Court in this cause, so far as challenged by The New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Company be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and so far as challenged by the York & Whitney Company be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Superior Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

La Belle Iron Works, Appellant,

453 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

per Mr. Justice Pitney.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds concurs in the result).

Elliott Frederick, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of John E. Schmidt, Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the Superior Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

547 vs.

The Fidelity Mutual Life Insurance Company of Philadelphia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Superior Court of the State of Pennsylvania and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Superior Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Pitney.

J. J. Dillon, Appellant, [illegible]

251 vs.

R. W. Gloss, Deputy Collector of United States Internal Revenue.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Anna Heitmuller, Plaintiff in error, vs. Sylvanus Stokes. 279

In error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed, costs incurred on writ of error to be paid by defendant in error; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia with direction to remand to the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia with instructions to dismiss the complaint.

per Mr. Justice Day.

Harry Krichman, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 260

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Day.

Robert B. Brown, Petitioner,
103 vs.
The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Texas for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Pitney.

Mr. Justice Clarke.

New York Trust Company and Albert W. Press, as Executors of the last Will and Testament of J. Hanson Purdy, deceased, plaintiffs in error,
286 vs.
Mark Eisner.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

American Bank & Trust Company et al., Appellants,
679 vs.
Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, Ga., et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and was argued

by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mike Blancett, Appellant, vs. Oscar Cardin, as Guardian of Jesse Daylight, a minor et al., 244

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Philadelphia & Reading Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Maria Domenica Di Donato. 297

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Clarke.

Philadelphia & Reading Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Mario E. Polk. 298

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Clarke.

The City of New York, Appellant, vs. The Brooklyn Union Gas Company. 311

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Ex Parte In the Matter of Exporters Manufacturers' Products, Inc., Petitioner. --- Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file petition for writs of prohibition and / or mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Ex Parte In the Matter of C. C. Hartwell Company, Limited, et al., Petitioners, --- Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Ex Parte In the Matter of D. H. Riddle, Petitioner, -- Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Julius F. Smietanka, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc., 710 vs. Indiana Steel Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 10th, next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The Eureka Pipe Line Company, Plaintiff in error, 805 vs. Walter S. Hallanan, State Tax Commissioner et al.;

United Fuel Gas Company, Plaintiff in error, 835 vs. Walter S. Hallanan, State Tax Commissioner, et al.

On consideration of the motions to advance these cases, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, October 10th, next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Louisiana & Pine Bluff Railway Company, Appellant, 859 vs. The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 10th, next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The Eureka Pipe Line Company, Plaintiff in error, 805 vs. Walter S. Hallanan, State Tax Commissioner, et al., United Fuel Gas Company,

835 vs. Walter S. Hallanan, State Tax Commissioner et al.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the petitions for writs of certiorari in these cases be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the causes on the merits.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Michigan Central Railroad Company, Petitioner,
836 vs.
C. A. Gustafson et al., Copartners, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

John W. Keogh, Plaintiff in error,
843 vs.
Chicago & North Western Railway Company et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Clark T. Henderson, petitioner,
844 vs.
The Commissioner of Patents.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it it now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railway Company of Texas et al., Petitioners,
847 vs.
United States Mortgage & Trust Com-
pany et al., Trustees, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

James D. Hardin, Petitioner, vs. Union Trust Company of Philadelphia. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

848

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Fred B. Grant et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

860

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Director General of Railroads, Petitioner, vs. Sarah A. Wilson, Administratrix, etc., — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey.

865

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by

this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Charles Vincenti et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

877

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it it now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Nettie L. Scott, Petitioner, vs. Elizabeth K. DeFries, nee Filipo. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

882

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Hannah T. Willson, executrix, etc., plaintiff in error, vs. Curtis C. McDonnell. — It is now here ordered by the Court that counsel in this cause be requested to submit briefs upon the effect of the Ball Act (41 Stat. 298) upon the disposition of this cause. It is further ordered that such briefs be filed on or before the 23d instant.

303

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Mr. Justice McKenna announced that the Court will adjourn for the term on Monday, June 6th, next.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, 23, Original. vs. The State of Texas.

The motion of the United States, Intervenor herein, to set this cause down for final hearing as to certain parties was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the United States, Intervenor. Leave granted to file Amended Petition herein for the United States on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Frierson in that behalf with seven days' leave to Mr. C. Carroll Todd to file reply to such amended petition on behalf of the State of Texas.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, 23, Original. vs. The State of Texas.

The motion of the Burk Divide Oil Company and others for an order appointing a commissioner to take testimony, and to advance the cause for hearing in October 1921, was submitted by Mr. Jesse B. Roote in that behalf.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, 23, Original. vs. The State of Texas.

The motion for leave to file amended petition of A. E. Pearson and others herein was submitted by Mr. W. A. Ledbetter in that behalf. The motion to have a certain tract of land made subject to the operation of the order of the Court of June 7, 1920, and that same be returned to him as therein provided, was submitted by Mr. W. A. Ledbetter in that behalf.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, 23, Original. vs. The State of Texas.

The motion for leave to file amended petition of intervention of the Delta Oil Company and J. B. Lawson was submitted by Mr. F. W. Fischer in that behalf.
The motion for leave to file petition of intervention of R. L. Owen and others was submitted by Mr. F. W. Fischer in that behalf.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, 23, Original. vs. The State of Texas.

The Fifth Report of the Receiver in this cause was filed on motion of Mr. John Spalding Flannery of counsel for the Receiver.

Guno H. Rudolph et al., Commissioners of the District of Columbia et al., Petitioners, 897 vs. Mallie Schwartz.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Levi H. David in behalf of Mr. F. H. Stephens for the petitioners and by Mr. W. Gwynn Gardiner for the respondent.

John C. Heald et al Committee, etc., Plaintiff in error,
822 vs.
The District of Columbia.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. A. S. Worthington for the plaintiff in error.

Mrs. Addie Prohaska, widow, etc., et al., petitioners,
905 vs.
St. Paul Fire & Marine Insurance Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler and Mr. John D. Grace for the petitioners.

Carleton Hunt et al., plaintiffs in error,
891 vs.
The City of New Orleans et al.

The motion for an extension of time within which to submit petition for writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler in behalf of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

The State of North Dakota ex rel William Lemke, Attorney General, Complainant,
-- Original. vs.
Chicago & Northwestern Railway Company et al.

The motion for leave to file bill of complaint herein was submitted by Mr. Kark Knox Gartner and Mr. William Lemke for the complainant.

American Column and Lumber Company, et al., Appellants,
369 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion for a stay of part of the injunction in this cause was submitted by Mr. L. C. Boyle and Mr. C. Carroll Todd for the appellants in support of the motion and by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson and Mr. Henry S. Mitchell for the appellee in opposition thereto.

Southern Pacific Company et al., petitioners,
901 vs.
Olympian Dredging Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. C. F. B. Ogilby in behalf of Mr. E. J. Foulds and Mr. Elmer Westlake for the petitioners and by Mr. Thomas E. Haven for the respondent.

Ex parte in the matter of the State of Louisiana, -- Original. petitioner.	The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted by Mr. L. E. Hall for the petitioner.
Princess Amusement Company, petitioner, 875 vs. Jake Wells.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. T. T. McCarley for the petitioner.
Alexis Georgian, petitioner, 885 vs. Byron H. Uhl, Acting Commissioner of Immigration etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Walter Wells for the petitioner.
Jacques Rousso, petitioner, 893 vs. Harry Solomon.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. J. M. M. Potts for the petitioner, and by Mr. William F. Hall for the respondent.
Herman & Herman, Inc., petitioner, 896 vs. The Steamship "Owego", etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Homer L. Loomis for the petitioner.
Walker Bros. Company, petitioner, 900 vs. W. & H. Walker, Inc. et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Odin Roberts for the petitioner.
J. E. Sistrunk, petitioner, 903 vs. J. T. Pendleton, Judge.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. J. E. Sistrunk, pro se.
Charles F. Hunt, Executor, etc., Appellant, 470 vs. The United States	Appeal from the Court of Claims.

It appearing to the Court that counsel for the appellant has filed a motion to strike this cause from the docket for the reason that it had been improperly docketed,

It is, therefore, now here ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, stricken from the docket.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Tuesday, May 31st, next at 12 o'clock.

Tuesday, May 31st, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day,

Willis Van Devanter,

Mahlon Pitney,

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

John H. Clarke.

Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

Mr. Justice McKenna said:

Gentlemen of the Bar:

This empty chair, and the sombre drapery upon it, announce that since the last sitting of the Court a grievous affliction has come to the country, and to us—an affliction which to some of us, and, it may be, to all of us, can never have complete solace. A great life has ceased to exist, one replete with achievements—achievements in many fields of endeavor, all typical and demonstrative of ability and merit, of which, to adopt the words of another, "it would be difficult to say anything that would transcend the bounds of a just and decorous eulogy." Eulogy, however, will be the purpose and appointment of another time, and of other lips than mine. To mine now is the humbler and sadder deputation to express the sorrow of my brethren and myself at the death of our Chief Justice. But, expressing a more poignant and personal sorrow, may I not say, at the death of our associate in duties, our companion in council, our friend and intimate. He was all of these to us, and by them animated and directed our work; his precedence veiled under a considerate courtesy, our intercourse with him made a real enjoyment. I use the word "enjoyment" because I speak in retrospection—speak of a time upon which sorrow had not cast its shadow.

I hope I shall be pardoned these personal considerations. I do not overlook or underestimate the greater abilities that attracted the Nation's commendation in his life, and has caused the Nation's sorrow in his death—a sorrow in which we participate. But his faculties need not be distinguished—they were comprehensive in their action, had connection and purpose, were as manifest in private life as in official life.

In private life he was a gentleman in the best sense of that much abused word. He was considerately kind and courteous, and not in passing show, for he was incapable of artifice or dissimulation.

In official life he had a high and earnest sense of duty and duty to a judge has a special incentive, its object is justice and justice to the fullness of its definition, "the con-

stant and perpetual wish to render to every man his rights." This wish was ever in the Chief Justice's mind—its insistent motive and animation. And in this duty to individual serious questions came—questions of the validity of laws and executive acts, and the ordination of the powers of the United States and the States, granted or reserved to them respectively by the Constitution. To the questions thus presented the Chief Justice directed a consideration proportioned to their immediate and ultimate effect, the public welfare depending upon them. He realized, as all of us must realize, that the necessity of passing upon them marks the place and power of the Federal judiciary in our scheme of government—the condition, it may be, of its stability and permanence, preserving always the splendid conception of the Constitution—one sovereignty constituted of many—it being supreme within the sphere of its powers; they being supreme within the sphere of their powers, resulting in governments national and state, competent to encounter and resolve the problems incident to or emergent in the lives and affairs of a people.

This is of the past in barest outline—what of the future? Anticipating it I see no shadow on his fame, no lessening of his example nor of the impression his life and services have made upon the country. I venture comparisons. I make full concession of the recognized and illustrious merit of those who have preceeded him. I make full admission, in assured prophecy, of the abilities of those who will succeed him, yet, considering his qualities and their exercises, I dare to say, that, as he has attained, he will forever keep, a distinct eminence among the Chief Justices of these United States.

In testimony of his worth, in tribute and respect to his memory, the Court will adjourn until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, June 1st, 1911.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank H. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ross Collins, it is ordered that Richard S. Field, Esquire of Fayette, State of Mississippi and J.N. Hutchins, Esquire, of Orlando, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. W. Jeffris it is ordered that Joseph P. Uvick, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson it is ordered that Clarence J. Rosebery, Esquire, of Peoria, State of Illinois; Ivan P. Tschof, Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia and J. Julien Southerland, Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry G. Miller it is ordered that John W. Freels, Esquire, of East St. Louis, State of Illinois and John W. Preihs, Esquire of Pana, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Benjamin Carter it is ordered that Jesse L. Brennon, Esquire of Birmingham, State of Alabama be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James T. Lloyd it is ordered that C. Larimore Keeley, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas J. Walsh it is ordered that Antoinette Funk, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence R. Wilson it is ordered that Waldron Kintzing Post, Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John E. Baker it is ordered that Francis Carr, Esquire, of Redding, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas L. Blanton it is ordered that Thomas Jefferson Pitts, Esquire of Corman, State of Texas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Levi Cooke it is ordered that Neyle Colquitt, Esquire of Savannah, State of Georgia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler it is ordered that Basil Hobillard, Esquire of Niagara Falls, State of New York and Frank M. Stephen, Esquire of Hyattsville, State of Maryland be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Phil D. Swing it is ordered that John E. Biby, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Wednesday, June 1st, 1921, continued.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Reed it is ordered that Buell L. Matthews, Esquire of St. Louis; Simon C. Bates, Esquire, and Roscoe C. Patterson, Esquire of Springfield, and Sidney C. Roach, Esquire of Linn Creek, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Adrien F. Busick it is ordered that Alexander Robert Fordyce, Jr., Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer it is ordered that Harvey B. Cox, Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. M. Vale it is ordered that Walter C. Longstreth, Esquire of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John G. Sargent it is ordered that Oscar L. Young, Esquire of Laconia, State of New Hampshire be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

The District of Columbia, Petitioner, vs. R. P. Andrews Paper Company. 282

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that the judgment of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court.

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

The District of Columbia, Petitioner, vs. Saks and Company. 283

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that the judgment of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court.

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

The District of Columbia, Petitioner, vs. Abraham Lisner. 284

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs, and that the judgment of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court.

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Ernest B. Dane, Plaintiff in error, vs. James Jackson, Treasurer and Receiver General. 720

In error to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Judicial Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

The Choctaw, Oklahoma & Gulf Railroad Company and the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, Appellants, vs. B. W. Mackey, as County Treasurer of Hughes County, Oklahoma, The City of Holdenville et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

211

This cause came on to be head on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The Yazoo & Mississippi Valley Railroad Company and the United State Fidelity & Guaranty Company, petitioners, vs. Nichols & Company.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

216

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in error, vs. Charles G. A. Pfitsch.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

266

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this

Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, and Walker D. Hines, Director General of Railroads, plaintiffs in error, vs. H. A. F. Ault. 252

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company et al., plaintiffs in error, vs. H. A. F. Ault. 252

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Norfolk Southern Railroad Company, petitioner, vs. M. R. Owens. 223

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Western Union Telegraph Company, petitioner,

491. vs. Estevo Brothers & Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Pitney,

Mr. Justice Clarke.

John B. Sutton, Trustee of the Estate of Hillsboro Dredging Company, Bankrupt, appellant, 307 vs. The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed, except as stated in the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Ex Parte In the Matter of the State of New York, Edward S. Walsh, Superintendant, etc. et al., petitioners, 25, Original.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of prohibition and / or a writ of mandamus herein, of the return to the rule to show cause, and the argument of counsel thereupon had, It is now here ordered by the Court that the writ of prohibition as prayed be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Justice Pitney.

Ex parte In the Matter of the State of New York, Owners of the

Steam Tug "Queen City", petitioners. — On consideration of the petition for a writ of prohibition and / or a writ of mandamus herein, of the return to the rule to show cause, and the argument of counsel thereupon had,

28, Original.

It is now here ordered by the Court that the writ of prohibition as prayed by, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Justice Pitney.

Ex Parte In the Matter of the Lincoln Gas & Electric Company, petitioner, — This cause came on to be heard on the petition for a writ of mandamus and the return to the rule to show cause, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said rule to show cause be discharged and that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

29, Original.

per Mr. Justice Pitney.

Anchor Oil Company, Apellant, vs. W. H. Gray, F. D. McDonnell, Charles Egan et al. — Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

188

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma.

per Mr. Justice Pitney.

The United States of America, plaintiff in error, vs. A. Z. Hutto, J. R. White, Ray See, and J. R. Ricks. — In error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma.

691.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this

Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Pitney.

The United States of America, plaintiff in error, vs. A. E. Hutto. In error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma.

692

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Pitney.

Robert L. Culpopper, petitioner, vs. James M. Ocheltree. On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

302

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Archie J. McLaren, Administrator of the Estate of John McLaren, deceased. petitioner, vs. L. G. Fleischer. On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

291.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court the the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is

The United States of America, plaintiff in error, vs. George E. Bowling, Francis McMasters, and the Miami Investment Company. 295

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma for a new trial.

per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The United States of America, plaintiff in error, vs. Boze Yuginovich and Cousin Boze Yuginovich. 523

In error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

per Mr. Justice Day.

Joseph A. Burdeau, Appellant, vs. J. C. McDowell. 646

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be

ceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Day.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Mr. Justice Holmes.

The United States of America,
plaintiff in error,
175 vs.
The American Chicle Company.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Bethlehem Motors Corporation,
National Motor Car and Vehicle
Corporation, et al.,
plaintiffs in error,
254 vs.
George W. Flynt, Sheriff of
Forsyth County, North Carolina,
and D. A. Stafford, Sheriff of
Guilford County, North Carolina.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now there ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Pitney

Michigan Central Railroad Company, petitioner, vs. Mark Owen & Company. On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

299

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The Heirs of Samuel Garland, deceased, Appellants, vs. The Choctaw Nation. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

129

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice McKenna,

(Mr. Justice McReynolds and Mr. Justice Clarke took no part in the consideration of decision of this case).

The Houston & Texas Central Railroad Company, plaintiff in error, vs. The City of Ennis et al. In error to the Court of Civil Appeals, Fifth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

288

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Civil Appeals, Fifth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

The Dwelling Building & Loan Association and Dwelling Building and Loan Association, Trustee for Frank J. McSorley,

Appellants,

vs.

Winfield S. McHenry, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Bakers' Baking Company.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

318

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, vs. The State of Texas, Defendant; The United States of America, Intervener. — 23, Original.

[June 1, 1921.]

Upon application of A. E. Pearson, R. R. Bell, Susie Shaw, Georgia Darby, Mrs. John Mounts, Henry G. Beard, and the Silver Moon Oil Company, claimants of certain tracts or parcels of land purchased by Fred Capshaw from the United States of America under patent dated February 17, 1920;

It is ordered that the Receiver be and he is hereby authorized and directed to sink a well for oil and gas upon the land described in said patent at such place as the Receiver shall select, provided said applicants shall pay in advance from time to time as required the cost and expense of sinking the same and bringing it into production. The said well shall be operated by the Receiver as he operates wells on other lands in the river-bed area, and he shall conserve and dispose of the proceeds of the oil and gas as in the case of wells on other lands in the river-bed area, and shall reimburse the said Pearson, et al., out of the net proceeds for the moneys so advanced and paid by them for drilling the well and bringing it into production; the remainder of such proceeds to be retained by him subject to the order of the court.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Michigan Central Railroad Company, petitioner,
299 vs.
Mark Owen & Company.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The Heirs of Samuel Garland, deceased, Appellants,
129 vs.
The Choctaw Nation.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice McKenna,

(Mr. Justice McReynolds and Mr. Justice Clarke took no part in the consideration of decision of this case).

The Houston & Texas Central Railroad Company, plaintiff in error,
288 vs.
The City of Ennis et al.

In error to the Court of Civil Appeals, Fifth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Civil Appeals, Fifth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

The Dwelling Building & Loan Association and Dwelling Building and Loan Association, Trustee for Frank J. McSorley, Appellants, vs. Winfield S. McHenry, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Bakers' Baking Company.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

318

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, vs. The State of Texas, Defendant; The United States of America, Intervener. 23, Original.

[June 1, 1921.]

Upon application of A. E. Pearson, R. R. Bell, Susie Shaw, Georgia Darby, Mrs. John Mounts, Henry G. Beard, and the Silver Moon Oil Company, claimants of certain tracts or parcels of land purchased by Fred Capshaw from the United States of America under patent dated February 17, 1920;

It is ordered that the Receiver be and he is hereby authorized and directed to sink a well for oil and gas upon the land described in said patent at such place as the Receiver shall select, provided said applicants shall pay in advance from time to time as required the cost and expense of sinking the same and bringing it into production. The said well shall be operated by the Receiver as he operates wells on other lands in the river-bed area, and he shall conserve and dispose of the proceeds of the oil and gas as in the case of wells on other lands in the river-bed area, and shall reimburse the said Pearson, et al., out of the net proceeds for the moneys so advanced and paid by them for drilling the well and bringing it into production; the remainder of such proceeds to be retained by him subject to the order of the court.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, vs. The State of Texas, Defendant; The United States of America, Intervener. } 23, Original.

[June 1, 1921.]

Upon motion of Luther Eoff, claiming to be owner of an oil and gas lease upon a certain tract of 500 acres of land described in his motion, situate on the flood plain on the south side of Red River, in Range 15 West;

It is ordered that the Receiver be and he is hereby authorized and directed to sink a well for oil and gas upon the land described in said motion at such place as the Receiver shall select, provided said applicant shall pay in advance from time to time as required the cost and expense of sinking the same and bringing it into production. The said well shall be operated by the Receiver as he operates wells on lands in the river-bed area, and he shall conserve and dispose of the proceeds of the oil and gas as in the case of wells on lands in the river-bed area, and shall reimburse the said Eoff out of the net proceeds for the moneys so advanced and paid by him for drilling the well and bringing it into production; the remainder of such proceeds to be retained by the Receiver subject to the order of the court.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, vs. The State of Texas, Defendant; The United States of America, Intervener. } 23, Original.

[June 1, 1921.]

Upon motion of J. R. Armstrong, et al., and upon the assent of the Receiver, it appearing that the Receiver has in his hands a fund of approximately Fifty thousand dollars, being part of the proceeds derived by him from the production of Receiver's Wells Nos. 157, 162, and 170, operated by him for said Armstrong and for one C. J. Benson, under whom he claims by assignment;

It is ordered that Frederick S. Tyler, Esq., be and he is hereby appointed a special master to hear and report to this court for determination the claim of said J. R. Armstrong to have said fund turned over to him as purchaser of said wells; and said master shall hear and report on said claim and on all other claims that may be presented against said fund.

Said master shall have authority to issue process of subpoena to compel the attendance of witnesses, and it shall be his duty to give notice to all parties concerned, to fix the time and place of hearing, and adjourn the same from time to time if necessary; and he shall report all the evidence taken, together with his findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendation in the premises, for the ultimate consideration and action of this court.

If for any reason the said Frederick S. Tyler, Esq., shall be unable to act as such special master, or to complete his duties as such, a special master to act in his place shall be named by the Chief Justice or the senior Associate Justice of this Court.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, vs. The State of Texas, Defendant; The United States of America, Intervener. } 23, Original.

[June 1, 1921.]

Upon considering the Fifth Report of the Receiver, filed herein May 26, 1921, it is ordered:

(1) That until further order all development work by the Receiver (except as prescribed in certain other orders made this day) shall be confined to the completion of the wells in the river-bed area, about twelve in number, work upon which already has been begun.

(2) That the Receiver be and he is hereby authorized and directed to collect, withhold, and impound three-sixteenths of the gross proceeds of gas produced by wells within the receivership area from and after June 1, 1921.

(3) That the Receiver be and he is hereby authorized to publish a notice in four daily newspapers, two circulating in Texas and two circulating in Oklahoma, to be selected by him, requesting all persons having claims against the Receiver or against the property or funds in his custody to present the same to the Receiver within 60 days from the date of publication of such notice, accompanying their statements of claim with supporting affidavits and certified or sworn copies of any documentary evidence upon which they may rely; and the Receiver is directed to examine and investigate said claims and supporting evidence, and he is hereby authorized to settle and discharge the same if he can do so upon a fair and equitable basis; and as to any not so adjusted and settled he shall make a full report to this court at its next Term for such further action as the court may deem proper.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, vs. The State of Texas, Defendant; The United States of America, Intervener. } 23, Original.

[June 1, 1921.]

It appearing that special issues have been joined in this cause (1) upon the intervening petition of E. Everitt Rowell, claimant of riparian land on the north bank of Red River, and the answer thereto of the United States embodied in Paragraph II of its amended petition of intervention; (2) upon the intervening petition of A. E. Pearson, R. R. Bell, Susie Shaw, Georgia Darby, Mrs John Mounts, Henry G. Beard, and the Silver Moon Oil Company, claimants of riparian lands on north bank of Red River, and the answer thereto of the United States embodied in Paragraph II of its amended petition of intervention; (3) upon the amended petition of intervention of the Burk Divide Oil Company (Consolidated) and others, placer mining claimants, and the answer of the United States thereto embodied in Paragraph III of its amended petition of intervention; (4) upon the petition of intervention of the Mellish Consolidated Placer Oil Mining Association a placer mining claimant, and the answer thereto of the United States embodied in Paragraph III of its amended petition of intervention; (5) and as between the State of Oklahoma and the United States as to the school sections abutting on Red River owned by said State, in respect to which it claims by riparian right the entire bed of Red River to the south bank, as said claim is set up in the original bill of said State and answered by the United States in Paragraph II, sub-paragraph 10, of its amended petition of intervention:

It is ordered that this cause be and it is hereby set down for hearing as to said special issues, and as to the claims of any and

north bank of Red River or placer mining locations under the mining laws of the United States, on the seventeenth day of October, A. D., nineteen hundred and twenty-one.

Frederick S. Tyler, Esq., of Washington, D. C., is hereby appointed as commissioner to take the evidence of the said respective parties with respect to said issues and claims, and report the same to the court, but without findings or conclusions. Said evidence shall be taken and closed on or before July thirtieth, 1921. The evidence as to all said issues and claims shall be embodied in one record, but the evidence as to each issue or claim shall be set forth separately so far as practicable. Subject to the time fixed for closing said evidence, the time and place for commencing and proceeding with the taking of testimony, and the order in which the different matters shall be taken up, may be fixed by agreement of the parties, or in case of disagreement shall be fixed by the commissioner.

If for any reason the said Frederick S. Tyler shall be unable to act as such commissioner, or to complete his duties as such, a commissioner to act in his place shall be named by the Chief Justice or the senior Associate Justice of this Court.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, vs. The State of Texas, Defendant; The United States of America, Intervener.	**23, Original.** Order to show cause.

[June 1, 1921.]

It appearing from the Fifth Report made by Frederick A. Delano, the Receiver heretofore appointed by this court in the above stated cause, that an action recently was commenced against him in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas by the Casa Oil Company to recover damages for the alleged conversion of certain personal property claimed by said Casa Oil Company and alleged to have been siezed and appropriated by said Receiver; and that a citation has been issued by said court commanding said Receiver to appear in said cause and make answer to the petition therein at the next regular term of said court, to be held on the twenty-first day of November, A. D. 1921;

It is ordered that the Honorable James C. Wilson, Judge of the said United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, do show cause before this court, at the Capitol in Washington, in the District of Columbia, on the seventeenth day of October, A. D. 1921, why a writ of prohibition should not be issued commanding him to desist from further entertaining jurisdiction of said cause.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, vs. The State of Texas, Defendant; The United States of America, Intervener.	**23, Original.**

[June 1, 1921.]

It is ordered that Frederic A. Delano, Receiver, be and he is hereby authorized, in his discretion, out of thirteen-sixteenths of the net proceeds of any well or wells in the river-bed area (other than the well known as the Burk Senator) paid to him since April first 1920, to reimburse to those operators or drillers who had drilled and brought into production such well or wells, their actual cost of such work, including a reasonable allowance for field supervison, but excluding any allowance for general or office supervision, and after deducting a proper allowance for the yield derived by them from such well or wells prior to the taking possession of the same by the Receiver.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, vs. The State of Texas, Defendant; The United States of America, Intervener. } 23, Original.

[June 1, 1921.]

This court having on the seventh day of June, 1920, set this cause down for hearing upon specified questions of law, the hearing having been had, and the court having considered of the matter, and having announced its opinion and conclusion on April 11, 1921:

It is ordered, adjudged and decreed that according to the Treaty of 1819 between the United States and Spain, as heretofore examined and construed by this court in the case of *United States* v. *Texas*, 162 U. S. 1, the decree in which is conclusive upon the parties to this cause, the true boundary between the State of Oklahoma and the State of Texas where it follows the course of the Red River from the 100th degree of west longitude to the eastern boundary of the State of Oklahoma is along the south bank of Red River. And as it still needs to be determined between the State of Oklahoma, Complainant, and the United States of America, Intervener, on the one hand, and the State of Texas, on the other hand, as to what constitutes the south bank of Red River, as to where along that bank the true boundary line is, and as to the proper mode of locating the same upon the ground;

It is, on motion of the State of Oklahoma, concurred in by the State of Texas and the United States of America, ordered that this cause be set down for hearing upon those questions on the ninth day of January, A. D., 1922.

And it is ordered that upon said hearing the parties shall be at liberty to refer to and use the evidence heretofore taken and returned in this cause so far as applicable to said question, without the necessity of re-publication or reprinting; and they shall proceed to take such further evidence as they may desire relating, among other things, to the characteristics and regimen of Red River, the physical conditions along the same, any substantial changes that may have occurred since the Treaty by avulsions, relictions, erosions, accretions, or other natural causes, and the practical construction and application of the Treaty of 1819 by the governments and States concerned and their inhabitants.

Frederick S. Tyler Esq., of Washington, D. C., is hereby appointed as commissioner to take said further evidence and report the same to the court, but without findings or conclusions; and if for any reason said Frederick S. Tyler shall be unable to act as such commissioner, or to complete his duties as such, a commissioner, to act in his place shall be named by the Chief Justice or the senior Associate Justice of this Court.

Subject to the limitations hereinafter imposed, the times and places of taking such testimony, and the order of taking the same, may be fixed by stipulation of the parties, and, if they shall fail to stipulate, shall be fixed by the commissioner. The taking of testimony shall commence not later than the fifteenth day of August, 1921, and shall be concluded on or before the twenty-ninth day of October following. Unless the parties otherwise stipulate, the evidence in chief on the part of the United States shall be presented first, that on the part of the State of Oklahoma next, and that on the part of the State of Texas next; and the rebuttal evidence of the respective parties shall be presented in the same order.

The hearing on the counterclaim of the State of Texas, and the taking of testimony thereon, is reserved for further order.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, vs. The State of Texas, Defendant; The United States of America, Intervener. } 23, Original.

[June 1, 1921.]

It is ordered that no petition in intervention may hereafter be filed herein under the order of June 7, 1920, except upon special leave given by the court.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Ex Parte In the Matter of the State of Louisiana, Petitioner. --, Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The State of North Dakota ex rel. William Lemke, Attorney General, Complainant, --, Original. vs. Chicago & Northwestern Railway Company.

On consideration of the motions for leave to file original bill of complaint herein, and amendment to said original bill, and for an interlocutory injunction to stay proceedings pending suit,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the motions for leave to file original bill and the amendment to said original bill be, and the same are hereby, granted, and process ordered to issue returnable on Monday, October 3, 1921.

It is further ordered that the motion for an interlocutory injunction to stay proceedings pending suit be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

American Column & Lumber Company et al., Appellants, 369 vs. The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion for a stay of part of the injunction herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Carleton Hunt et al., Plaintiffs in error, 891 vs. The City of New Orleans, et al.

On consideration of the motion for extension of time within which to submit a petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

John C. Heald et al., Committee etc., Plaintiffs in error,
822. vs.
The District of Columbia.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 10th, 1921, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Southern Pacific Company et al., petitioners,
901. vs.
Olympian Dredging Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Alexis Georgian, Petitioner,
885 vs.
Byron H. Uhl, Acting Commissioner of Immigration, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Princess Amusement Company, petitioner,
875 vs.
Jake Wells.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and of the argument of counsel in support of the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Jacques Rousso, Petitioner,
893 vs.
Harry Solomon.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Herman & Herman, Inc., petitioner,
896 vs.
The Steamship Owego, her Engine, etc.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counse in support of the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Cuno H. Rudolph et al., Commissioners, etc., et al., petitioners,
897 vs.
Mollie Schwartz.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and of the atgument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is here by, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Walker Brothers, Company, petitioner,
900 vs.
W. & H. Walker, Inc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

J. E. Sistrunk, petitioner,
903 vs.

J. T. Pendleton, Judge. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia and of the argument of counsel in support of the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Mrs. Addie Prohaska, Widow etc., et al., petitioners, 905 vs. St. Paul Fire and Marine Insurance Company. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The United States of America, petitioner, 898 vs. Wesley L. Sachs. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Solicitor general Frierson for the petitioner.

Federal Trade Commission, petitioner, 925 vs. The Curtis Publishing Company. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson and Mr. Adrien F. Busick for the petitioner, and by Mr. John G. Milburn, Mr. Joseph W. Welsh, Mr. John G. Milburn, Jr., and Mr. Ralph B. Evans for the respondent.

Federal Trade Commission, petitioner, 931 vs. United Hosiery Company. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson and Mr. Adrien F. Busick for the petitioner and by Mr. Henry P. Molloy for the respondent.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,

The State of Texas. The motion by the United States, Intervenor herein, to set the cause down for hearing on the issues as to the south bank; response of the United States to the petition of intervention of R. L. Owen et al.; supplemental amended petition of intervention of the United States in further answer to the amended petition of A. E. Pearson et al., response of the United States to the amended petition and application of the Delta Oil Company et al.; and observations of the United States upon the Receivers Fifth Report and his report on Claims, submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson for the United States.

The United States, Appellant,
806 vs.
The Western Union Telegraph Company. Mr. Solicitor General Frierson, of counsel for the appellant in this cause, called the attention of the Court the the Act of Congress approved May 27th, 1921, relating to the subject matter of this case. On motion of Mr. Clarence R. Wilson, of counsel for the appellee herein, leave was granted him to file suggestions in response within ten days.

Henry Albers, petitioner,
308 vs.
The United States of America. The motion for leave to intervene in this cause and present a petition for rehearing was submitted by Mr. C. L. McNary in that behalf.

The State of Texas, Complainant,
--, Original. vs.
The Interstate Commerce Commission et al. The motion for leave to file a bill of Complaint in this cause was submitted by Mr. C. M. Cureton for the Complainant.

Edgar A. Levy Leasing Company, Inc.,
plaintiff in error,
853 vs.
Jerome Siegel;
The People of the State of New York,
ex rel Brixton Operating Corporation,
plaintiff in error,
854 vs.
Edward B. LaFetra, a Justice, etc.;
and
810 West End Avenue, Inc.,
plaintiff in error,

Henry R. Stern. The motion to dismiss or affirm in these cases was submitted by Mr. Henry H. Glassie, Mr. William D. Guthrie, Mr. Julius Henry Cohen and Mr. Bernard Hershkopf for the defendants in error in support of the motion and by Mr. Louis Marshall and Mr. L. M. Isaacs for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

Santa Fe Pacific Railroad Company, Appellant,
451 & 452. vs.
John Barton Payne, Secretary, etc.,
John Barton Payne, Secretary, etc., plaintiff in error,
693 vs.
The United States of America ex rel., ex rel. W. T. Mosier et al.

On motion of Mr. Alexander Britton in that behalf, the resignation of John Barton Payne, as Secretary of the Interior was suggested and Albert B. Fall as present Secretary of the Interior substituted as the party appellee and plaintiff in error in these cases.

O. O. Askren, Attorney General of the State of New Mexico, et al., Appellants,
695 vs.
Continental Oil Company.

On motion of Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, in that behalf the resignation of O. O. Askren as Attorney General of New Mexico was suggested and Harry S. Bowman, present Attorney General was substitued as a party appellant in this cause.

Rensselaer L. Curtis, Receiver, etc., Appellant,
365 vs.
John J. Connly et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

Mr. Lucien H. Boggs, of counsel for appellant, suggested the death of Arthur W. Dennis, one of the appellees in this cause, and moved the Court for an order, under the 15th Rule, to make the proper representatives parties;

Thereupon, It is now here ordered by the Court that unless the proper representatives of the said Arthur W. Dennis, deceased, as aforesaid, shall voluntarily become parties within the first ten days of the ensuing term of this Court, the appellant shall be entitled to open the record and, on hearing, have the decree reversed if it be erroneous; Provided, however, that a copy of this order shall be printed in some newspaper of general circulation within the State of Rhode Island for three successive weeks at least sixty days before the beginning of the term of the Supreme Court then next ensuing.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania,
Complainant,
20, Original. vs.
The State of West Virginia;
and
The State of Ohio, Complainant,
21, Original. vs.
The State of West Virginia.

The motion that these cases be set down for argument and heard together was submitted by Mr. P. P. Steptoe in that behalf, with leave to Mr. A. Leo Weil to file a brief in opposition to the said motion.

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
23, Original. vs.
The State of Texas.

The motion for leave to file petition in intervention of D. D. Brunson et al., was submitted by Mr. George Trice in that behalf.

R. D. Langan et al.,
plaintiffs in error,
619 vs.
The City of Louisville.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. C. R. McAtee in behalf of counsel for the defendant in error.

McKittrick Oil Company,
plaintiff in error,
801 vs.
Southern Pacific Railroad Co.

The motion to dismiss of affirm in this cause was submitted by Mr. Frank Thunen for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. George E. Whitaker and Mr. Fred Dennet for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Old Dominion Beverage Corporation,
petitioner,
908 vs.
The Coca-Cola Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. William L. Symonds for the petitioner and by Mr. Harold Hirsh and Mr. Edward S. Rogers for the respondent.

Sarah F. Donley, petitioner,
707 vs.
Erwin Ray Van Horn; and
Sarah F. Donley, petitioner,
708 vs.
Prescott West.

The motion to postpone submission of petitions for writs of certiorari in those cases until the hearing on the writs of error was submitted by Mr. William R. Andrews in behalf of counsel for the petitioner.

The State of Vermont, Complainant,
7, Original. vs.

The State of New Hampshire. On motion of Mr. John S. Matthews and Mr. John G. Sargent leave is granted to file stipulations as to amendment to answer, as to replication, as to defendant's rejoinder, and as to appointment of commissioners to take testimony and documentary evidence in this cause.

Charles S. Fairchild, appellant,
572 vs.
Charles E. Hughes, Secretary of State of the United States et al. On motion of Mr. J. H. Adriaans in that behalf, leave is granted him to file brief as amicus curiae in this cause.

Marie E. Scheurle, Administratrix, etc., petitioner,
711 vs.
Onepiece Bifocal Lens Company. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Arthur E. Paige for the petitioner and by Mr. V. H. Lockwood for the respondent.

The State Tax Commission of the State of New York, petitioner,
871 vs.
The People of the State of New York ex rel Alpha Portland Cement Company. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Claude T. Dawes for the petitioner and by Mr. Louis H. Porter for the respondent.

W. E. Hamilton et al., petitioners,
909 vs.
De Camp Glass Casket Company et al. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Charles C. Moore for the petitioners, and by Mr. J. B. Sizer and Mr. J. Reed Voight for the respondent.

John P. Kline et al., etc., petitioners,
911 vs.
Burke Construction Company. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Frank S. Quinn and Mr. William H. Arnold for the petitioners.

Lou Frazier, Administratrix, etc., petitioner,
914 vs.
Interstate Railroad Company. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. William H. Werth for the petitioner.

Gustav H. Jacobson, petitioner,
916 vs.
The United States of America;

Albert H. Wehde, petitioner,
917 vs.
The United States of America;
and
George Paul Boehm, petitioner,
918 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Henry W. Freeman and Mr. Michael L. Igoe for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. William C. Herron for the respondent.

Lehigh Valley Railroad Company,
petitioner,
921 vs.
John Lysaght, Limited.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Lindley M. Garrison, Mr. Edgar H. Boles, Mr. George S. Hobart and Mr. Charles A. Boston for the petitioner and by Mr. W. Kintzing Post for the respondent.

Lehigh Valley Railroad Company,
petitioner,
922 vs.
Allied Machinery Company of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Lindley M. Garrison, Mr. Edgar H. Boles, Mr. George S. Hobart and Mr. Charles A. Boston for the petitioner, and by Mr. Hartwell Cabell for the respondent.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads as Agent, etc.,
plaintiff in error,
924 vs.
J. J. Smith, Jr., Administrator, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. J. Blanc Monroe, Mr. Monte M. Lemann, Mr. A. S. Bozeman, Mr. L. E. Jeffries, Mr. S. R. Prince and Mr. H. O'B. Cooper for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition.

Fred Brown, plaintiff in error,
933 vs.
Charles B. Thorn et al. etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. James B. McDonough for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition.

Ike Applebaum, petitioner,
923 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Chester H. Krum for the petitioner.

William Green, petitioner,
930 vs.

Thomas B. Felder, Receiver, etc., et al. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Francis M. Scott and Mr. William J. Hughes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frederic R. Kellogg for the respondent with leave to Mr. Solicitor General Frierson to file suggestions hereafter.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, June 6th next at

Monday, June 6th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Vaile it is ordered that William J. L. Crank, Esquire, of Denver and Samuel Freudenthal, Esquire, of Trinidad, State of Colorado be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson it is ordered that Frank J. Kelly, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin; William G. Brantley, Jr., Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia; Charles Clark, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia and Joseph K. Hutchinson, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. C. Rosebery it is ordered that Oscar R. Middleton, Esquire of Gibson City, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. M. Shortridge it is ordered that William Freeman, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander H. Clark, it is ordered that Henry Uttal, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Henry Butler it is ordered that Alfred T. Davison, Esquire, of New York City and William Boye, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George H. Lamar it is ordered that John C. Carmichael, Esquire, of Birmingham, State of Alabama and Harry F. Helwig, Esquire, of Kendallville, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William C. Kenyon it is ordered that James W. Good, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. A. Coombs, it is ordered that Elmer McD. Lintz, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Philip Pitt Campbell it is ordered that Summerfield S. Alexander, Esquire, of Kingman and Richard A. Bird, Esquire of Wichita, State of Kansas and John J. McSwain, Esquire of Greenville, State of South Carolina be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph Millenson it is ordered that M. Malcolm Slikes, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Milton Strasburger it is ordered that David B. Samuel, Esquire, of Shreveport, State of Louisiana be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in thisbehalf by Mr. John J. Gorman it is ordered that John C. Kleczka, Esquire of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin and Frank J. Mazurkrewicz, Esquire of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of the Court and they were sworn accord-

On motion of Mr. W. W. Bride, it is ordered that Duncan Campbell Lee, Esquire of London, England be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence S. Lee it is ordered that Charles A. Wetmore, Esquire of Marysville, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler it is ordered that Louis J. Frank, Esquire of Brooklyn, State of New York be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James T. Lloyd it is ordered that Thomas L. Lloyd of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Weber Electric Company, petitioner, vs. E. H. Freeman Electric Company. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

273

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals as to claims 1 and 4, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey.

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Western Union Telegraph Company, petitioner, vs. S. B. Poston. — On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

293

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and

the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Adelbert Harris, by his next friend Albert Harris, — On a certificate from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

16 vs.

The District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the question certified must be answered in the affirmative.

Whereupon it is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said Court of Appeals.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Holmes,

Mr. Justice Brandeis,

Mr. Justice Clarke.

The Seaboard Air Line Railway,

Appellant,

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

62 vs.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims with direction to afford reasonable opportunity to both sides for taking any additional proof rendered necessary by the withdrawal of the United States of a stipulation upon which reliance had been placed; and for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The Kansas City Southern Railway Company

and the Texarkana and Fort Smith Rail-

way Company, plaintiff in error,
205 vs.
Road Improvement District Number 6
of Little River County, Arkansas.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Kansas City Southern Railway Company et al., plaintiffs in error,
205 vs.
Road Improvement District Number 6 of Little River County, Arkansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The Merchants' National Bank of Richmond, Virginia,
plaintiff in error,
240 vs.
The City of Richmond.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice Pitney.

The Merchants's National Bank of Richmond, Virginia,
plaintiff in error,
240 vs.
The City of Richmond.

In error to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court of Appeals, in this cause, be and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court of Appeals for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Harry S. Bowman, Attorney General of the State of New Mexico et al., Appellants, vs. The Continental Oil Company. 695

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of New Mexico.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of New Mexico and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree, of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Pitney.

Ex Parte In the Matter of Hussein Lutfi Bey, Master of the Turkish Government Steamship "Gul Djemal" -- Orig. petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of prohibition and / or a writ of mandamus herein, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The Texas Company, petitioner, vs. Hogarth Shipping Corporation, Limited, Owner of the Steamship "Baron Ogilvy" and Hugh Hogarth & Sons. 555

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United

States for the Southern District of New York.

per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The United States, Appellant,
811 vs.
Alan H. Woodward, Oscar W. Underwood and Reginald H. Banister as Executors of Joseph H. Woodward, deceased.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railway Company, Appellant,
52 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

McKitterick Oil Company,
plaintiff in error,
801. vs.
Southern Pacific Railroad Company.

In error to the District Court of Appeal for the Second Appellate District, Division No. 1, State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of Appeal for the Second Appellate District, Division No.1, State of California, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
806 vs.
Western Union Telegraph Company.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Counsel are requested to submit briefs concerning the effect of the Act of Congress approved May 27, 1921, entitled: "An Act to prevent the unauthorized landing of submarine cables in the United States", upon the future consideration and disposition of this cause. Same to be filed on or before the first day of the October Term, 1921, of this Court.

The State of Texas,
Complainant,
-- Original. vs.
The Interstate Commerce Commission et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a bill of complaint herein, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and process is ordered to issue returnable on Monday, October 3d next.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania,
Complainant,
20, Original. vs.
The State of West Virginia.
The State of Ohio, Complainant,
21, Original. vs.
The State of West Virginia.

On consideration of the motions to set these cases for final hearing and for other directions, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said motions, be, and the same are hereby, granted, and the cases are set for hearing on Monday, December 5th next, and are directed to be heard consecutively.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Edgar A. Levy Leasing Company Inc.,
plaintiff in error,
853 vs.
Jerome Siegel.
The People of the State of New York ex rel Brixton Operating Corporation,
plaintiff in error,
854 vs.
Edward B. La Fetra, a Justice of the City Court of the City of New York.

820 West End Avenue, Inc., plaintiff in error,
855 vs.
Henry R. Stern.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in these cases be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cases on the merits.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

R. D. Langan et al., plaintiffs in error,
619 vs.
The City of Louisville.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on the second day of the October Term, 1921.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
23, Original vs.
The State of Texas.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file petition in intervention of D. D. Brunson herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Henry Albers, petitioner,
308 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion for leave to intervene and present a petition for rehearing herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Sarah F. Donley, petitioner,
707 vs.
Erwin Ray Van Horn.
Sarah F. Donley, petitioner,
708 vs.
Prescott West.

On consideration of the motions to postpone the submission of the petitions for writs of certiorari in these cases until the hearing on the writs of error in Nos. 831 and 832, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, as Agent etc., plaintiff in error,
924 vs.

J. J. Smith, Jr., Administrator, etc.

It is ordered by the Court that the consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the writ of error.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The United States of America, petitioner,

898 vs.

Wesley L. Sischo.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

John F. Kline et al., as the Board of Improvement, etc., petitioners,

911. vs.

Burk Construction Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Federal Trade Commission, petitioner,

925 vs.

The Curtis Publishing Company.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon and as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Federal Trade Commission,
petitioner,
931 vs.
Winsted Hosiery Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Fred Browne,
plaintiff in error,
933 vs.
Charles B. Thorn et al., Partners doing business as Thorn & Maginnis.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Marie E. Schmerle, Administratrix, etc.,
petitioner,
711 vs.
Onepiece Bifocal Lens Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the District Court of the United States for the District of Indiana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the District Court of the United States for the District of Indiana and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The State Tax Commissioner of the State of New York, petitioner,
871 vs.
The People of the State of New York ex rel Alpha Portland Cement Company.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Old Dominion Beverage Corporation, petitioner,
908 vs.
The Coca Cola Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it it now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

W. E. Hamilton et al., petitioners,
909
DeCamp Glass Casket Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Lou Frazier, Administratrix, etc., petitioner,
914 vs.
Interstate Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it it now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Gustav H. Jacobson, petitioner,
916 vs.
The United States of America;
Albert H. Wehde, petitioner,
917 vs.
The United States of America;

George Paul Boehm, petitioner,
918 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Lehigh Valley Railroad Company, petitioner,
921 vs.
John Lysaght, Limited.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Lehigh Valley Railroad Company, petitioner,
922 vs.
Allied Machinery Company of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Ike Applebaum, petitioner,
923 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

William Green, petitioner,
930 vs.
Thomas B. Felder, Receiver, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The State of Wyoming, Complainant,
4, Original. vs.
The State of Colorado et al. ;

American Steel Foundries, petitioner,
13 vs.
The Tri-City Central Trades Council et al.;

Adelbert A. Weiland, as State Engineer, Appellants,
14 vs.
Pioneer Irrigation Company;

William Truax et al., etc., plaintiffs in error,
72 vs.
Michael Corrigan et al.;

The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, plaintiff in error,
157 vs.
Daniel J. Perry;

Hannah T. Willson, plaintiff in error,
303 vs.
Curtis C. McDonnell;

United Shoe Machinery Corporation et al., Appellants,
476 vs.
The United States of America;

It is ordered by the Court that these cases be restored to the docket for reargument before a full bench.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The Atherton Mills, Appellant,
124 vs.
Eugene T. Johnston et al.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be restored to the docket for reargument before a full Bench, and the attention of counsel is called to the question of the jurisdiction of the United States District Court.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Dahnke-Walker Milling Company,
plaintiff in error,
235 vs.
C. T. Bondurant.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be restored to the docket for reargument before a full Bench, and the attention of counsel is called to the question of the jurisdiction of this Court.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Mr. Justice McKenna said:

"GENTLEMEN OF THE BAR: It is my sad office to announce that another sorrow has come to the Court in the death of Mr. James D. Maher, its clerk—a sorrow following close upon that of which this empty chair is testimony—a sorrow having particular emphasis, and we are impelled to its expression and manifestation.

"Our association with him was personal and official. Where personal, he exhibited an attractive courtesy; where official, he impressed a sense of ability and that trust could be reposed in him.

"His connection with the Court began over a half a century ago—to be exact, in 1865, as a page, and from that humble beginning he rose successively to be junior clerk, deputy clerk, and clerk. By this advancement his ability was availed of as much as rewarded, and it was justified to the last moment of his service—service ending only with his life.

"What more need be said? The successive promotions proclaim his merit; verbal enunciation or eulogy of it is an unnecessary supplement. I, however, venture some particulars. Among other powers he had the power of taking pains, and that in high degree. It was a constituent of his efficiency which gave an assurance of exactness and confident reliance upon whatever he did or was to do.

"And he thought nothing a trouble; he was prompt, therefore, to grant any request or obey any direction, heightening thereby his courtesy or duty. In this I am repeating the appreciation of our [illegible] greater degree than the rest of us had occ[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] his rare and comprehensive knowledge of the procedural precedents and practices of the court was of inestimable service to the members of the bar, and he was always ready to render that service.

[illegible] of his merit and our appreciation of it: he [illegible] to fulfill his duties and obligations as he was in official life, and his example and services will remain with us a cherished and intimate memory; to those who succeed us they will be an instructive tradition."

The United States, Appellant, vs. American Can Company et al. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Maryland.

5

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Frierson, of counsel for the appellant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal,

Therefore in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Ex parte in the matter of the Lincoln Gas & Electric Light Company, petitioner, 29, Original. — On motion of Mr. Challen B. Ellis in that behalf, leave is hereby granted him to present a petition for a rehearing of this cause within sixty days.

O R D E R .

The Reporter having represented that, owing to the number of decisions at the present term, it would be impracticable to put the Reports in one volume,

It is therefore, now here ordered that he publish an additional volume in this year pursuant to Section 226 of the Judicial Code, approved March 3, 1911.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

O R D E R .

It is now here ordered by the Court that all the cases on the docket not decided and all the other business of the term not disposed of be, and the same are hereby, continued to the next term.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until the time and place appointed by law.

GBG-6-11-21.